



CRM-M-43320-2025

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

108

CRM-M-43320-2025
Decided on: 17.03.2026

SAPNA

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Ms. Meenakshi Dogra, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Kanwar Sanjiv Kumar, AAG, Haryana.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

1. Prayer is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 in criminal case bearing FIR No.204 dated 02.04.2025 registered under Sections 406, 420, 120-B of IPC at Police Station Sector-10, Gurugram, District Gurugram.

2. On 08.08.2025, following order was passed:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that there is a dispute between the petitioner and complainant regarding money transactions. Petitioner received money from the complainant Nikita Dahiya, her father Ashok Dahiya and mother Parmila and the money was returned back and regarding this a tabular form of returned amount is attached in page No.11 of her petition. Counsel for the petitioner further submits that petitioner is also ready to return back the balance amount with interest, if any, is due. It is further submitted that it is a civil dispute and same was converted into a criminal complaint by the complainant just to pressurize the petitioner.

Notice of motion.

Mr. Karan Veer Singh, Sr. DAG, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of respondent-State and seeks time to file reply and address the arguments.



Adjourned to 17.09.2025.

In the meanwhile, the petitioner is hereby directed to join investigation and in the event of her arrest, she be released on interim bail by the IO/Arresting Officer subject to his own satisfaction till the next date of hearing. The petitioner is directed to abide by the conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023.”

3. Continuing the submissions, learned counsel for the petitioner refers to the details set out in paragraph No.8(C) of the present petition, wherein, in a tabulated form, the amounts received in the petitioner's bank account and the amounts paid back to the complainant/victims, namely Ashok Dahiya, Nikita Dahiya, and Parmila, have been delineated.

Learned counsel contends that a perusal of the details mentioned in paragraph No.8(C), reflecting bank transactions spanning the years 2018 to 2023, clearly indicates that both the sides were engaged in frequent financial transactions, with amounts being exchanged multiple times between their respective bank accounts. It is argued that, in the event of any discrepancy, disagreement, or confusion, registration of the FIR for recovery of money is nothing, but an attempt to exert pressure and coerce a settlement.

It is further submitted that complainant, being influential, has succeeded in initiating criminal proceedings against the petitioner, despite the dispute being purely civil in nature.

4. Further submits that in compliance of the order dated 08.08.2025, passed by this Court, petitioner has joined the investigation, and has fully co-operated. Therefore, he prays for confirmation of the said interim anticipatory bail order.



CRM-M-43320-2025

3

5. Learned State counsel on instructions from ASI Sunil Kumar, confirms the said averment made by counsel for the petitioner of joining the investigation by the petitioner, but he did not cooperate with the investigating agency during the course of investigation.

6. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

7. This Court is of the opinion that objection raised by learned State counsel is untenable and without any basis. Since petitioner has already joined the investigation, ad-interim bail order dated 08.08.2025, passed by this Court, is hereby made absolute. **Accordingly, present petition stands allowed.**

However, petitioner shall continue to join the investigation as and when required to do so and abide by all the terms and conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023.

8. Accordingly, petition stands disposed of.

9. However, present order would be subject to the submission of passport of the petitioner to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if he possesses, within a period of one week from today. Otherwise, he would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that he does not possess any passport.

It is clarified that in case, aforesaid condition is not complied with, this order would be considered as *non est* automatically.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

17.03.2026
Lavisha

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES/NO
Whether Reportable: YES/NO