

2026:PHHC:028978



102

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-48281-2024 (O&M)

Parvita Devi

....Petitioner

versus

Union Territory Chandigarh

....Respondent

Date of Decision: February 24, 2026

Date of Uploading: February 24, 2026

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Ms. Ishani Goyal, Advocate,
Mr. Sarjiwan Kumar, Advocate and
Ms. Navjot Kaur, Advocate for
Mr. Surjit Singh Swaich, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Manish Bansal, Public Prosecutor, U.T.,
Mr. Dixit Bhardwaj, Advocate and
Ms. Swadha, Advocate for the respondent – U.T., Chandigarh.

Mr. Kamaldeep S. Sidhu, Advocate for the complainant.

SUMEET GOEL, J. (ORAL)

Present petition has been filed under Section 482 of the
Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') for grant of
concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, in case FIR No.30 dated
18.04.2024, under Sections 420, 467, 468 and 120-B of the IPC, 1860, at
Police Station I.T., Park, Union Territory, Chandigarh.

2. On 26.09.2024, the following order was passed:

*“Prayer in this petition is for grant of anticipatory bail to the
petitioner in case FIR No.30 dated 18.04.2024 under Sections 420, 467,
468, 120-B of the IPC registered at Police Station I.T. Park, Union
Territory, Chandigarh.*

*Learned counsel for the petitioner inter alia contends that it is a
matter of record that even as per the records of Registrar of Companies
(ROC) the petitioner had resigned as director from M/s Pinnacle Kissan*

Products Ltd. (hereinafter referred to as 'Company') on 09.06.2020. Thus, she could not in any manner be connected with the allegations levelled qua misappropriation of the amount given by the complainant for the purchase of shares in the said Company. It has also been submitted that, if at all, it is essentially a civil dispute between the parties for which the complainant has already availed of his remedy before the Civil Court concerned.

Notice of motion.

On asking of the Court, Mr. Manish Bansal, P.P., U.T., Chandigarh, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-U.T., Chandigarh.

At this stage, Mr. Kamaldeep S. Sidhu, Advocate has entered appearance and filed his power of attorney on behalf of the complainant which is taken on record.

Learned State counsel is directed to file reply.

Adjourned to 15.10.2024.”

2.1. On 15.10.2024, the following order was passed:

“On the last date of hearing, learned standing counsel for U.T., Chandigarh, had been directed to file reply, however, it has still not been received.

Learned counsel appearing for the complainant has filed his reply in the Court today which is taken on record. A copy of the same has been supplied to the counsel opposite.

Learned standing counsel for U.T., Chandigarh shall positively comply with the order dated 26.09.2024 and file reply before the next date of hearing with a copy in advance to the counsel opposite.

It is made clear that no further adjournment shall be granted.

Adjourned to 20.11.2024 for final arguments.

Meanwhile, no coercive steps shall be taken against the petitioner only till the next date of hearing.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner, while reiterating her submissions as recorded in the above orders, has argued that the case in hand primarily emanates from a civil dispute. Learned counsel has further argued that in the order dated 17.02.2025 passed in **Special Leave Petition (Criminal) Diary No(s).2243/2025**, the Hon’ble Supreme Court has stayed proceedings pursuant to the FIR in question. Learned counsel has further submitted that the petitioner is willing to join investigation and cooperate therein.

4. Learned counsel for the respondent – U.T., Chandigarh (on instructions from Sub Inspector Surinder Singh) has vehemently opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner by arguing that there are direct/

serious allegations against the petitioner, and, hence, her custodial interrogation is required for effective investigation.

5. Learned counsel for the complainant, while raising submissions in tandem with the reply dated 10.10.2024, already filed on behalf of the complainant, has vehemently opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner by arguing that there are direct/serious allegations against the petitioner. In case, the petitioner is extended the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, the same would impede investigation as also there are chances of the petitioner absconding from the process of justice as also interfering with the prosecution evidence/witnesses. On the strength of these submissions, dismissal of the petition in hand is entreated for.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the rival parties and upon perusal of the record; especially, keeping in view the entirety of factual *milieu* of the case in hand, an interim order enuring in favour of the petitioner since October 2024, there being no allegations of misuse of said interim order, the order dated 17.02.2025 passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court staying proceedings *qua* FIR in question; this Court is inclined to allow the present petition.

7. *Ergo*, the petition in hand is **allowed**; the petitioner is extended the concession of anticipatory bail, subject to her appearing before the Investigating Officer as and when called upon, and furnishing personal/surety bond(s) to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer/Investigating Officer. The petitioner shall abide by the condition(s) enumerated under Section 482(2) of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023. Needless to say that the Investigating Officer, while calling upon the petitioner, to join investigation, shall keep in view and abide by the order dated 17.02.2025 passed by the

Hon’ble Supreme Court in Special Leave Petition (Criminal) Diary No(s).2243/2025.

8. This order should not be treated as “blanket” order. It will not be read granting petitioner indefinite protection from arrest. It shall be confined to the FIR mentioned *ibid* and will not operate in respect of any other incident that involves commission of an offence.

9. Liberty is reserved in favour of respondent-U.T./complainant to move for cancellation/recall of this order in case the petitioner violates any condition stipulated under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 or upon showing any other sufficient cause.

10. Needless to say that anything observed herein above shall not be construed to be an opinion on the merits of the case.

11. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

February 24, 2026

mahavir

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No