



CRM-M-37764-2025 and
CRM-M-42809-2025

1

106

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-37764-2025

Meena Kumari

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CRM-M-42809-2025

Teg Singh @ Bittu

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

Decided on: 24.03.2026

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Lajpat Rai Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner(s) (in both cases)

Mr. Parveen Kumar Aggarwal, Addl. A.G. Haryana

Mr. Rahul Dahiya, Advocate
for the complainant

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (ORAL)

CRM-48541-2025 in
CRM-M-37764-2025

This is an application for impleading complainant-Kulbhushan son of
Mahavir Parshad, resident of Siwan, Tehsil Siwan, District Kaithal as respondent
No. 2.

For the reasons mentioned in the application, the same is allowed and



**CRM-M-37764-2025 and
CRM-M-42809-2025**

2

respondent No. 2 – Kulbhushan is impleaded as party-respondent.

Amended Memo of Parties is taken on record. Registry is directed to tag the same at appropriate place.

**CRM-M-37764-2025 and
CRM-M-42809-2025**

1. By way of this common order, both the above-mentioned petitions are being decided together as they arise out of the same FIR and common allegations.
2. Both the above mentioned petitioners namely–(i) Meena Kumari (in CRM-M-37764-2025) and (ii) Teg Singh @ Bittu (in CRM-M-42809-2025) have filed petition under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438 Cr.P.C.), for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner(s), who have been booked in a criminal case arising out of FIR No.108, dated 24.06.2025, under Sections 406, 420 IPC, registered at Police Station Siwan, District Kaithal.
3. Initially, FIR in the present case was registered at the instance of complainant-Kulbhushan with the allegation that accused namely (i) Bittu Rana (ii) Sanjeev Pandit (iii) Ashok, (iv) Meena Saini @ Meena Kumari, allured complainant-Kulbhushan under the pretext of arranging a Government job and took an amount of Rs. 27 lacs from him.
4. Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that infact false and baseless allegations have been levelled. He submits that FIR lacks specific details regarding the complainant's educational qualifications or the eligibility of the person for whom the job was allegedly ensured.
5. Hearing the petitioner's counsel on 18.07.2025, following was recorded in Meena Kumari's case :



**CRM-M-37764-2025 and
CRM-M-42809-2025**

3

(i) xx xx xx xx

(ii) *Upon perusal, the allegations levelled in the FIR appear to be highly improbable. Neither the educational qualifications of the complainants/victims have been detailed, nor the specific post for which the alleged amount was paid to the petitioner has been mentioned. Therefore, on the face of the allegations, no cognizable offence appears to be made out.*

(iii) *Notice of motion.*

(iv) *On advance notice, learned State counsel puts in appearance on behalf of the respondent – State, and seeks some time to respond to the submissions addressed by learned counsel opposite, after seeking instructions. And, in case of necessity, to file status report by verifying the submissions addressed by the petitioner’s counsel.*

(v) *Adjourned to 19.08.2025.*

(vi) *Meanwhile, arrest of the petitioner shall remain stayed till the next date of hearing.*

Similar was the contentions recorded in other connected petition filed by Teg Singh @ Bittu.

6. He further submits that, as per affidavit dated 04.11.2025, given by him, an amount of Rs. 13 lacs has already been returned to the complainant Kulbhushan. In the said affidavit, it is mentioned that the entire amount was received through RTGS i.e. Rs. 8 was received in the complainant's father (Mahavir Prasad) bank account number 07262191038832, IFSC Code PUNB0072610, Punjab National Bank, Siwan, and Rs. 5 lacs in bank account number 50100510012664, IFSC Code 2, HDFC0001726, HDFC Bank, Siwan. He further refers to the affidavit and submits that nowhere in the said affidavit is it mentioned for what purpose the amount was originally given by complainant to the petitioner or accused in the present case.



**CRM-M-37764-2025 and
CRM-M-42809-2025**

4

7. Undoubtedly, the allegations are serious. Even in the telephonic talks appended in the transcribed form with the status report, learned State counsel could not point out where petitioner agreed to provide a job to the complainant, or that any amount was taken by him or any other accused for said purpose. Thus, the allegations need to be established by the prosecution beyond a reasonable doubt by adducing evidence before the trial Court. The financial dispute, if any, on the verge of being resolved, as a partial amount has already been paid back to the complainant.

8. If the actual dispute is not as put forth by the complainant and involves only money transactions, it would remain a question before the trial Court to determine whether the criminal matter was registered through proper method or not under the law.

9. Accordingly, petitioners are directed to join the investigation within two weeks from today, or as and when called by the investigating agency, and in the eventuality of the arrest, petitioners would be released on anticipatory bail, subject to their furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer. The petitioners shall also be abide by all the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.).

10. Besides, it is directed that petitioners would hand over their passport to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if they possesses. Otherwise, would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that they do not possess any passport.

It is also directed that before leaving country any time during trial, petitioners would seek prior permission of the Court.



**CRM-M-37764-2025 and
CRM-M-42809-2025**

5

11. It is also clarified that in case, if the contention got recorded by the petitioner in regard to the payment of amount of Rs. 13 lacs into the bank account of the complainant's father is found be incorrect, it will be open for the prosecution/complainant to move an application for revival of the present petitions.

12. With the directions issued here above, both the petitions stand disposed of.

13. Pending application, if any, also stand disposed of.

14. A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of connected case.

24.03.2026

reena

**(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes/No*
Whether Reportable: *Yes/No*