



CRM-M-51864-2025 1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

103-1

CRM-M-51864-2025
Decided on: 19.02.2026

JASPREET KAUR
.....Petitioner
Versus
STATE OF PUNJAB
.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Gaganvir Singh Gill, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438 Cr.P.C.), is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name & age of Petitioner (s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Jaspreet Kaur, aged about 48 years	0163	22.08.2025	316(2), 318(4) and 61(2) of BNS, 2023	Civil Lines	Patiala

2. On 15.09.2025, following order was passed:-

“1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438 Cr.P.C.), is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-



<i>Name & age of Petitioner (s)</i>	<i>FIR No.</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Section(s)</i>	<i>Police Station</i>	<i>District</i>
<i>Jaspreet Kaur, aged about 48 years</i>	<i>0163</i>	<i>22.08.2025</i>	<i>316(2), 318(4) and 61(2) of BNS, 2023</i>	<i>Civil Lines</i>	<i>Patiala</i>

2. *Counsel for the petitioner, inter alia contends that as per the case of prosecution, complainant, Lakwinder Dass, an immigration agent, had previously assisted Kuldeep Singh’s son in travelling to the U.K., leading to the development of family relations between them. In April, 2024, Kuldeep Singh approached the complainant to facilitate the immigration of his wife, Jaspreet Kaur, and another son, Dogar Singh, for which they agreed upon a sum of Rs.17 lakhs. Complainant prepared the necessary documents for Jaspreet Kaur and Dogar Singh and arranged for the promised visas, having incurred expenses of approximately Rs.13 to 14 lakhs in the process. However, when the complainant demanded payment, he was allegedly threatened by the petitioner and other co-accused. The FIR alleges that petitioner, Jaspreet Kaur, and her husband, Kuldeep Singh, committed criminal breach of trust and cheating, thereby defrauding the complainant of Rs.15,25,000/- on the pretext that full payment would be made after the grant of the visas.*
3. *Counsel for the petitioner contends that no such assurance was ever given, nor there is any written undertaking or settlement to that effect. Furthermore, it is submitted that FIR was registered to pressurize the petitioner and co-accused for recovery of the alleged amount, and thus, the dispute is essentially of a civil nature. Moreover, petitioner is ready to join the investigation and fully cooperate, if protected from arrest by this Court. Thus, prays for grant of concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in the present case.*
4. *Notice of motion.*
5. *On advance notice, Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab, puts in appearance on behalf of the respondent – State, and seeks some time to file status report in the matter.*
6. *Adjourned to 08.12.2025.*
7. *Meanwhile, the petitioner is directed to join the investigation as and when required to do so by the Investigating Agency. In the event of her arrest,*



the petitioner shall be released on ad-interim bail, subject to her furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer. The petitioner shall also be abide by all the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.).

8. Besides, it is directed that petitioner would hand over her passport to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if he possesses. Otherwise, would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that she does not possess any passport.

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

3. Continuing his submissions, learned counsel for the petitioner contends that in compliance of the order dated 15.09.2025, 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.

4. Learned State Counsel, on instructions, confirms the averment made by counsel for the petitioner that petitioner has joined the investigation on 01.11.2025. However, he submits that although, petitioner has joined the investigation in compliance with the directions issued by this Court, but she is not cooperating with the Investigating Officer, as the relevant documents have not yet been furnished.

5. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

6. *Prima facie*, contention raised by learned counsel for the petitioner is that the dispute, if any, is purely of a civil nature and has been given the colour of a criminal case only to pressurize the petitioner. Moreover, parties were known to each other and certain dealings had already been concluded between them in the past; therefore, no criminal offence is made out in the present case.



CRM-M-51864-2025

4

However, at this stage, learned State counsel, on instructions, submits that after joining of investigation by the petitioner, *challan* has already been presented on 22.01.2026.

7. Considering the totality of circumstances and the factors discussed here above, this Court deems it appropriate to allow the present petition. Accordingly, the ad-interim bail order dated 15.09.2025, passed by this Court, is hereby made absolute, and present petition, thus, 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 she possesses, within a period of one week from today. Otherwise, she would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that she does not possess any passport.

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

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

19.02.2026
Lavisha

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