



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

101

**CRM-M-54411-2022 (O&M)
Date of decision: 12.02.2026**

KOMAL KHANNA

.....Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

.....Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present: - Mr. Sunil Chadha, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Aditya Jain, Advocate and
Mr. Yatin Mehta, Advocate
Mr. Gurkirat Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Paras Talwar, Senior DAG, Haryana.

Mr. R.S. Kalra, Advocate for the complainant.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

CRM-25077-2023

Application is allowed as prayed for and Annexure P-17 is
taken on record.

CRM-M-54411-2022

The petitioner has filed the instant petition under Section 438 of
the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 for grant of pre-arrest bail in case
bearing FIR No. 215 dated 29.10.2022 registered under Sections 177, 195,

406, 420, 467, 468, 471, 506 and 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station Sector-20, Panchkula.

Vide order dated 24.11.2022, the following order was passed by this Court :-

“Apprehending her arrest in FIR No. 215 dated 29.10.2022 for offences punishable under Section 177, 195, 406, 420, 467, 468, 471, 506 and 120-B IPC, 1860 registered at Police Station Sector 20, Panchkula the petitioner has preferred this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C seeking pre-arrest bail.

Learned counsel for the petitioner inter alia contends that the dispute relates to an alleged alteration viz-a-viz share of the petitioner as well as the complainant in a partnership firm. Allegation against the petitioner is that she forged the partnership deed to get her share enhanced from 50% to 95% and reduced the share of the complainant from 50% to 5%. He further submits that infact in the earlier FIR No. 4/19 dated 21.08.2019 registered for the offences punishable under Section 11 and 12 of The Prevention of Corruption Act, 2018 at Police Station, SV&ACB Solan., against one of the co-accused namely Nishant Sareen, complainant suffered a statement wherein his specific stand was as under:-

“This product was already expired and the inquiry of it was conducted by his predecessor officer Kapil Dhiman. Nishant Sareen had pressurized me to sign a new partnership deed of Zhenia Pharmaceuticals which was already prepared by him. According to this new deed, Komal Khanna was shown as partner of 95% share and I was shown as partner of 5% share in the firm. He told me to go to Komal and to sign the said deed. He also told me that now the license is cancelled for 45 days and if you have not signed the said deed then I will cancel your permit. Due to his pressure, I came under pressure

and signed the above said deed in front of the residence of Komal, thereafter I alone gone and signed the register of Notary under his pressure.”

He thus, contends that after having raised allegations in the earlier FIR that the complainant was coerced to sign the new partnership deed whereby his share was reduced from 50% to 5%, complainant in the present FIR can't be believed while taking a completely different stand claiming that the partnership deed reducing his share from 50% to 5% is the result of forgery committed by the petitioner and her co-accused.

Notice of motion.

Mr. Ashok S. Choudhary, Addl. Advocate General, Haryana who is present in Court accepts notice on behalf of the State and Mr. Keshav Pratap Singh, Advocate who has put in appearance on behalf of the complainant accepts notice on behalf of the complainant. He prays for time to file reply. May do so before the next date of hearing.

To come up on 17.4.2023.

In the meantime, in the event of arrest, the petitioner shall be released on interim bail subject to her furnishing personal and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer/Investigating Officer. As and when called, the petitioner shall join the investigation. She shall abide by the conditions enumerated under Section 438(2) of the Cr.P.C.”

Counsel for the petitioner contends that a cancellation report has since then been prepared by the respondents and is likely to be presented soon.

The aforesaid claim is not disputed by the Counsel for the respondents.

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

In view of the above, the present petition is allowed and the interim order dated 24.11.2022 is made absolute.

FEBRUARY 12, 2026
Vishal Sharma

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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