



CRM-M-55691-2025 (O&M)

-1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-55691-2025 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 10.04.2026

Date of uploading: 10.04.2026

DIMPLE KHAROUR

... Petitioner

Versus

DIRECTORATE OF ENFORCEMENT THROUGH ITS ASSISTANT
DIRECTOR

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI

Present: Mr. Vikram Chaudhri, Sr. Advocate with
Ms. Hargun Sandhu, Advocate and
Mr. Duja Bhagwan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Satya Pal Jain, Addl. Solicitor General of India with
Mr. Mr. Akash Vashisth, Central Govt. counsel
for the respondent-ED.

Mr. Harmandeep Singh Saini, Advocate with
Mr. Dushant Jog, Advocate
for the complainant.

Mr. Harkanwar Jeet Singh, Asstt. A.G., Punjab.

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J.

The prayer in the present petition under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 is for the grant of regular bail in case bearing Complaint Case No.COMA-2-2025 arising out of ECIR/JLZO/26/2024 dated 25.11.2024 registered under Section 4 of the Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2002.

2. As per the prosecution complaint of the Directorate of Enforcement its Jalandhar Zonal Office shared information under Section

**CRM-M-55691-2025 (O&M)**

-2-

66(2) of PMLA with the police of Police Station Gautam Budh Nagar (Noida) leading to lodging of FIR no.463 dated 24.11.2024 by Police Station Sector 58, Noida, against M/s Vuenow Marketing Services Limited (VMSL, accused no.5), M/s Zebyte Infotech Private Limited (ZIPL, accused no.7), M/s Zebyte Rental Planet Private Limited (ZRPPL, accused no.8) and others regarding offence under Sections 318 (4), 61(2), 316(2) of BNS. The facts disclosed as per the said FIR are that the said Zonal Office of the Complainant Department had conducted searches under Foreign Exchange Management Act (FEMA) on 17.10.2024 concerning companies like accused no.5 to 8. During those proceedings it came out that accused no.5 had been offering customers an investment opportunity to buy Data Centre Assets or Cloud Particles under its “MyCloudParticle” brand. The scheme under which this offer was being made, was S-L-B (Sale and Lease Back) model. As per this model, a customer would buy a Cloud Particle which would be immediately leased back by VMSL through its marketing affiliates above said ZIPL and ZRPPL on long term basis for a minimum guaranteed monthly rent. Each such Cloud Particle was of cloud storage space 1 TB. It was also found out that M/s Vuneow Infotech Private Limited (VIPL) purchases servers and IT equipment from different suppliers and sells the same to VMSL which then sells the Cloud Particles to different investors who would make these purchases. This space is leased back through market affiliates ZIPL and ZRPPL. These marketing affiliates pay assured monthly rental income to the investors by leasing back the Cloud Particles from investors

**CRM-M-55691-2025 (O&M)****-3-**

for a minimum period of 10 years. These searches were conducted at the Data Centre of M/s VIPL at Khasra No.1246/3, Morta, Meertu Road, Ghaziabad (U.P.) on 17.10.2024 and 18.10.2024. It was found by 18.10.2024 that total storage capacity active in the servers there at that time was only 553 TB out of which only 1.9 TB space was lying consumed. Remaining space 551.1 TB yet was empty. This 1.9 TB data also pertains to test Openstack cloud data and no data of any individual customer was available in the servers nor any customer care type service was being provided from the servers. 1119 servers also were found there which had no power supply. Those were not in working condition. Financial irregularities regarding inadmissible ITC obtained by ZRPPL were also noticed. The VMSL office at Zirakpur, Punjab, was searched on 17.10.2024 where also huge irregularities were found. Similarly, the search conducted on 17.10.2024 at Chhat Bir Office, Mohali of VIPL also had brought out grave irregularities. The total live data storage capacity was 2701 TB across all data centres at different locations. The data storage facility provided by ZRPPL to its clients was found substantially low as compared to storage facility leased by that company from investors. Statements of officials of these Centres were recorded. Documents were taken into police possession. Bank record also was collected. It was found from the Data Centre of M/s VIPL Morta, Meertu Road, Ghaziabad (U.P.) that in the absence of any customer data there could be no rental income generated by VIPL and ZRPPL who had taken the Cloud Particles on lease from individual customers and claims to have given on rent to customers for

**CRM-M-55691-2025 (O&M)**

-4-

data storage and other services. The financial trail was studied which brought out that VMSL pays money to VIPL against purchase of servers. VMSL receives money from individuals/customers against sale of Cloud Particles. Those Companies ZIPL and ZRPPL were found receiving rental money from VIPL instead of receiving it from customers. This money then was being paid to the individual in the form of rent. In such manner, the money collected from investors was simply being rotated and paid to them as monthly assured rental income. It was a fraudulent investment scheme where rents were being paid out to previous customers using the capital from new customers. No money was being paid from profit earned by the operation. It was a non-sustainable business model. These companies VMSL, VIPL, ZIPL and ZRPPL thereby had committed offence under Sections 318(1), 318(4), 316(1) and 31(2) of BNS. The said case FIR no.463/2024 was referred by Police Station Sector 58, Noida to Crime Branch Noida where it is under investigation. FIR no.311 and FIR no.250, both dated 18.12.2024, were registered separately at Police Station Sahnewal and Police Station Division No.6, Jalandhar, under Sections 316 (2), 318(4), 61(2) and 111 of BNS against Sukhwinder Singh Kharour as CEO of VMSL and ZIPL. VMSL had committed cheating by selling Cloud Particles to others. In absence of substantial cloud storage facility, representation was made by VMSL that they had signed MOUs with Bulgarian and Himachal Pradesh Authorities and fake future prospects for future growth of the Company were projected. The accused party had generated ₹3717 crores by selling Cloud Particles, which

**CRM-M-55691-2025 (O&M)**

-5-

do not exist, thereby they cheated and breached the trust of various investors. The current ECIR was registered by the complainant/Department. During investigation, the role of the petitioner was established. As per investigation, she is one of the shareholders of Vuenow group of companies and her husband Sukhwinder Singh Kharour is a Director of said companies. Investigation brought out that by rotating the money in the abovesaid manner the Proceeds of Crime (POC) about ₹ 3717 crores were generated through such criminal activities by the accused and above said companies. It also was found that from this amount about ₹40.85 crores was received by the petitioner from VMSL and VIPL. A huge part of this amount had gone to her personal account. She was also found to have diverted over ₹ 85 lakhs from VMSL to M/s Fruitchaat Entertainment Private Limited in which she was one of the Directors. About ₹42 lakhs were diverted from VMSL to M/s Avni ITinfra Ventures Limited in which again she is one of the Directors. She had participated actively in the involved crime, had diverted, and layered the POC. She was arrested on 28.02.2025 at about 06:15 pm at Indira Gandhi International Airport, New Delhi. In that backdrop, and after completion of investigation qua her, the prosecution complaint stood filed by the respondent department.

3. The learned Senior counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner who is a lady of the age of about 45 years alongwith a minor child of the age of 15 years has no role in the affairs of M/s VMSL and M/s VIPL. She was only a shareholder to the extent of 7%, 8/9 years ago. Taking the

**CRM-M-55691-2025 (O&M)****-6-**

allegations to be correct, the petitioner and entities connected to her have received an amount of approximately Rs.41 crores. She is in custody since 28.02.2025. The complaint comprises of 7000 pages with 70 documents. The cognizance order has been set aside by this Court. The Trial is unlikely to conclude anytime soon as the scheduled offences emanating out of FIR No.463 dated 24.11.2024 U/s 318(4), 61(2) & 316(2) BNS, P.S. P.S. Sector 58, Noida District Court, Commissionerate Gautam Budh Nagar, U.P., FIR No.250 dated 18.12.2024, U/s 316(2), 318(4), 61(2) & 111 BNS, 2023, P.S. Division No.6, Ludhiana, Punjab, FIR No.311 dated 18.12.2024, U/s 316(2), 318(4), 61(2) & 111 of BNS, 2023, P.S. Sahnewal, Ludhiana, Punjab, FIR No.339 dated 26.12.2025, U/s 318(4), 316(2) & 61(2) BNS, 2023, P.S. Division No.7, Ludhiana, Punjab, FIR No.63 dated 11.03.2026, U/s 111, 316(2), 318(4) & 61 (2) of BNS, 2023, P.S. P.S. Sarabha Nagar, Punjab, FIR No.90 dated 28.06.2025, U/s 318(4), 316(2) & 61 BNS, 2023, P.S. P.S. Barnala, Punjab, FIR No.777 dated 23.09.2025, U/s 318(4), 316(2), 61(2) & 3(5) of BNS, 2023 & Section 3 The Maharashtra Protection of Interests of Depositors (in Financial Establishment), Act, 1999, P.S. P.S. Ramnagar, Maharashtra and FIR No.17 dated 06.01.2026, U/s 61(2), 316(5), 318(4) & 3(5) BNS, 2023 & 6(1) Madhya Pradesh Protection of Interests of Depositors Act, 2000, P.S. P.S. Timarni, Harda, Madhya Pradesh are still under investigation. The immovable properties in the name of the petitioner already stand attached to the extent of more than Rs.6 crores. Other than immovable property, 09 vehicles in the name of the petitioner and her bank accounts also

**CRM-M-55691-2025 (O&M)**

-7-

stand attached. If the petitioner was to be convicted, the sentence imposed upon her would be imprisonment for a maximum period of 07 years and she has already undergone more than one year as an undertrial. The provisions of Section 45 of the PMLA Act would not apply to her as she is a lady. He, therefore prays that the petitioner be granted the concession of bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned counsel for the respondent-ED and the learned counsel for the complainant while referring to the reply dated 12.11.2025 contend that the petitioner and her husband alongwith others have generated proceeds of crime to the extent of more than Rs.3700 crores and the investigation are still pending. An amount of approximately Rs.41 crores has come directly into the account of the petitioner or into the account of entities controlled by her. Merely because she is a lady would not *ipso facto* entitle her to the concession of bail. Therefore, the present petition is liable to be dismissed. They, however, concede that the petitioner is in custody since 28.02.2025 and that the order taking cognizance has been set aside.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

6. The role of the petitioner-Dimple Kharour is mentioned in para 27 of the reply dated 12.11.2025 and the same reads as under:-

“27. Role of Dimple Kharour:

i. Dimple Kharour is observed to be a shareholder to the tune of 7% in M/s VMSL in 2018-19 and is one of the beneficial owners of the proceeds generated by the company through modus operandi as discussed above.

ii. On analysis of the bank accounts, it has been gathered that Dimple Kharour in her personal accounts and entities related to her, had received Rs 40.85 Crore from M/s VMSL and M/s VIPL.



iii. During the course of scrutiny of bank accounts, it was observed that Dimple Kharour in her personal accounts have received a substantial amount of at least Rs. 16.42 crores from M/s VMSL and Rs. 2.98 crores from M/s VIPL. The details are as below:-

SN	Source of Funds	Received in which account	Amounts (in crores)
1	M/s VMSL	Personal account of Dimple Kharour	16.42
2.	M/s VIPL		2.98

iv. Also, the scrutiny of the bank accounts revealed that a significant amount of Rs.20.18 crores have been transferred from the account of Vuenow group to M/s Kharour Films LLP which is a partnership firm of Dimple Kharour and Sh. Sukhwinder Singh Kharour. Being the active partner and authorized signatory and the approver of the bank accounts of M/s Kharour Film LLP, Dimple Kharour is actively control and manage all the activities of the said entity. The details are as below:-

SN	Source of Funds	Received in A/c of	Amounts (in crores)
1	M/s VMSL, M/s VIPL & M/s Kaspi Services Pvt Ltd	Kharour Films LLP	33.52 Crore

v. Also, it is found that the diversions of Rs. 85.35 lakhs from M/s VMSL to M/s Fruitchaat Entertainment Pvt Ltd where Dimple Kharour and Sh. Abhaydeep Mutti are the directors. The details are as below:- The details are as below:-

SN	Source of Funds	Received in which account	Amounts (in crores)
1	M/s VMSL	Fruitchaat Entertainment Pvt. Ltd.	0.85

vi. Also, there are transfer of funds of Rs. 41.9 lakhs from M/s VMSL to M/s Avni ITInfra Ventures Limited Wherein Dimple Kharour, Sh.



Rahul Bhargav and Smt. Ruchi Srivastav are the directors. Moreover, there are transfers of Rs. 12.10 crores from M/s VMSL and M/s VIPL to M/s Can and Able Entertainment Pvt. Ltd. which has the same address as M/s Avni ITinfra Ventures Limited i.e. Plot No 82 Industrial Area, Phase-1, Chandigarh – 160002.

SN	Source of Funds	Received in which account	Amounts (in crores)
1	M/s VMSL	Avni ITinfra Venturs Ltd.	0.42

In the above-mentioned companies, Dimple Kharour have following roles:

S. No.	Name of company	Role of Dimple Kharour
1.	M/s Kharour Films LLP	Designated partner (06.02.2021 to till date)
2.	M/s Fruitchaat Entertainment Pvt Ltd	Director (29.09.2021 to till date)
3.	M/s Avni Itinfra Ventures Limited	Director (05.02.2021 to till date)

vii. During the course of investigation, it is found that Dimple Kharour had incorporated M/s Kharour Film LLP for production of movies. She is having 80% of the shareholding of the said entity. The source of funds of the said entity is the proceeds of crime from M/s VMSL and M/s VIPL.

viii. During the course of investigation, it is found that Dimple Kharour had purchased six immovable properties registered in her name purchased from the proceeds of crime received in her accounts from the accounts of Vuenow Group.

ix. During the course of investigation, it is found that Dimple Kharour used to attend the seminars which were conducted by Vuenow Group on the invitation of her husband Sukhwinder Singh Kharour. It is pertinent to mention here that she is well aware about the project 'mycloudparticle'.



x. During the course of investigation, it is found that Dimple Kharour is the authorized signatory and initiator & approver of the bank account in the name of M/s Kharour Film LLP. She used to make the payments and used to sign the cheques of the said bank account.

xi. During the course of investigation, it is found that Dimple Kharour is the authorized signatory and initiator & approver of the bank account in the name of Fruitchaat Entertainment Pvt Ltd. She is having 60% of shareholding. She used to make the payments to the persons/ entities.

xii. During the course of investigation, it is found that Dimple Kharour used to make the huge expense towards purchase of gold, suits, travels, boutique and others. Dimple Kharour has failed to state the satisfactory remarks/ reasons for the transactions.

xiii. During the course of investigation, it is found that Dimple Kharour is the director of the company namely M/s Kharour Films Limited registered at 1st Floor, 6-7 St. Mary At Hill, London, England. She is having 100 shares of the said entity. Also, Dimple Kharour is one of the directors of M/s Vuenow Technologies Pvt. Ltd registered at Shaw Centre, Singapore. The purpose to incorporate the said firm was to seek new opportunities regarding IT technology in South Asia Country. To identify the role of these entities in the instant case, the investigation is under progress.

*xiv. As elaborated above of this complaint, Dimple Kharour had knowingly assisted Sukhwinder Singh and indirectly assisted Sukhwinder Singh Kharour in one or more processes or activity connected with the proceeds of crime including its concealment, acquisition, use and further in projecting and claiming the said POC as untainted thereby had committed the offence of money laundering within the meaning of section 3 of Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2002, which is punishable under section 4 of the Act *ibid.*”*

7. Accepting the allegations to be correct, the petitioner and entities controlled by her have received an amount of approximately Rs.41 crores



from M/s VMSL and M/s VIPL. She is in custody since 28.02.2025 but even the cognizance has not been taken till date as the earlier order taking cognizance was set aside by this Court vide order dated 27.01.2026 passed in CRM-M-34731-2025. The prosecution has cited as many as 52 prosecution witnesses. The complaint comprises of 7000 pages and 70 documents.

8. As many as 08 FIRs stand registered against the petitioner and her co-accused for having committed scheduled offences. The details of the said FIRs and their respective stages of investigation are as under:-

S. No.	Particulars of FIR	Nature of offences	Police Station	Status of case
1.	FIR No.463 dated 24.11.2024	318(4), 61(2) & 316(2) BNS	P.S. Sector 58, Noida District Court, Commissionerate Gautam Budh Nagar, U.P.	Under investigation
2.	FIR No.250 dated 18.12.2024	316(2), 318(4), 61(2) & 111 BNS, 2023	Division No.6, Ludhiana, Punjab	Cancellation report dated 08.01.2025 filed
3.	FIR No.311 dated 18.12.2024	316(2), 318(4), 61(2) & 111 of BNS, 2023	Sahnewal, Ludhiana, Punjab	Cancellation report dated 08.01.2025 filed
4.	FIR No.339 dated 26.12.2025	318(4), 316(2) & 61(2) BNS, 2023	Division No.7, Ludhiana, Punjab	Under investigation



5.	<i>FIR No.63 dated 11.03.2026</i>	<i>111, 316(2), 318(4) & 61(2) of BNS, 2023</i>	<i>P.S. Sarabha Nagar, Punjab</i>	<i>Under investigation</i>
6.	<i>FIR No.90 dated 28.06.2025</i>	<i>318(4), 316(2) & 61 BNS, 2023</i>	<i>P.S. Barnala, Punjab</i>	<i>Under investigation</i>
7.	<i>FIR No.777 dated 23.09.2025</i>	<i>318(4), 316(2), 61(2) & 3(5) of BNS, 2023 & Section 3 The Maharashtra Protection of Interests of Depositors (in Financial Establishment) , Act, 1999</i>	<i>P.S. Ramnagar, Maharashtra</i>	<i>Under investigation</i>
8.	<i>FIR No.17 dated 06.01.2026</i>	<i>61(2), 316(5), 318(4) & 3(5) BNS, 2023 & 6(1) Madhya Pradesh Protection of Interests of Depositors Act, 2000</i>	<i>P.S. Timarni, Harda, Madhya Pradesh</i>	<i>Under investigation</i>

Apparently, as the investigation into the scheduled offences and the present complaint are still underway, it is unlikely that the Trial would begin anytime soon.

9. The immovable properties in the name of the petitioner already stand attached and the details of the same are under:-

B.Immovable Properties:-

S. No.	Description of Immovable property	Owner of property	Sale deed No.	Area	Amount of Immovable property (Rs.)
1.	Village Todar Majra, Kharar, SAS Nagar	Dimple Kharour W/o Sukhwinder Singh Kharour	Sale deed No.2023-24/15/1/195 90 dated 11.03.2024	05 kanal	Rs.1,30,00,000/-
2.	Village Todar Majra, Kharar, SAS Nagar	Dimple Kharour W/o Sukhwinder Singh Kharour	Sale deed No.2023-24/15/1/195 93 dated 11.03.2024	03 kanal 12.5 marla	Rs.15,00,000/-
3.	Agricultural land at Village Makran, Kharar	Dimple Kharour W/o Sukhwinder Singh Kharour	Sale deed No.2024-24/198/55 dated 25.04.2024	12 kanal 16 marla	Rs.45,00,000/-
4.	Plot No.28 Min Waka Bhan Colony Area Village Abloval, Patiala	Dimple Kharour W/o Sukhwinder Singh Kharour	2021-22/11/1/159 06 dated 27.01.2022	126 sq. yards	Rs.14,00,000/-
5.	H. No.169, Phase-3B1, Sector 60, SAS Nagar, Mohali	Dimple Kharour W/o Sukhwinder Kharour	2021/3/1/11 149 dated 16.02.2021	500 sq. yds	Rs.4,00,00,000/-
				Total	Rs.6,06,95,000/-

Additionally, 09 vehicles and all the bank accounts of the petitioner have also been attached.



CRM-M-55691-2025 (O&M)

-14-

10. In **Shashi Bala @ Shashi Bala Singh Vs. Directorate of Enforcement, Criminal Appeal No.212 of 2025 arising out of SLP (Criminal) No.16260 of 2024**, the Hon'ble Supreme Court held as under:-

“On its plain reading, the first proviso to subSection (1) of Section 45 operates as an exception to clause (ii) of sub-Section (1) of Section 45 of the PMLA. Therefore, when a woman applies for bail, the twin conditions in clause (ii) need not be satisfied. Though we have granted time to the learned Additional Solicitor General to make submissions in support of the submission that notwithstanding the proviso to sub-Section (1) of Section 45 of the PMLA, rigours of clause (ii) of sub-Section (1) of Section 45 of the PMLA will apply even to a woman, today the learned Solicitor General appears and states that rigours of clause (ii) of sub-Section (1) of Section 45 of the PMLA will not apply to a woman, in view of proviso to sub-Section (1) of Section 45 of the PMLA.

A charge has been framed. However, there are 67 witnesses and recording of evidence is yet to commence. Our attention is invited to the counter affidavit filed by the respondent and, in particular, what is stated in paragraph Nos. 9 to 16.

There are no antecedents of the appellant brought on record.

As rigours of clause (ii) of sub-Section (1) of Section 45 of the PMLA will not apply, the Special Court ought to have treated the application as the one under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (for short, "Cr.P.C.") or Section 483 of the Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short, "BNSS"). Hence, the first proviso to sub-Section (1) of Section 437 of the Cr.P.C. (the first proviso to sub-Section (1) of Section 480 of the BNSS) will apply. As the predicate offence is not under the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985, the maximum sentence can be of 7 years. The appellant is a woman. There is no possibility of the trial concluding in near future,



CRM-M-55691-2025 (O&M)

-15-

considering the fact that 67 witnesses are to be examined. There are no antecedents of the appellant brought on record. Therefore, a case is made out for enlarging the appellant on bail till the conclusion of the trial.

For that purpose, the appellant shall be produced before the Special Court within a maximum period of one week from today. The Special Court shall enlarge the appellant on bail on appropriate terms and conditions including the condition of regularly and punctually attending the Special Court and cooperating with the Special Court for early conclusion of the trial. Apart from the other conditions which will be imposed by the Special Court, a condition of deposit of the passport shall be imposed. The learned counsel for the respondent shall be heard on the terms and conditions.

We make it clear that if the appellant fails to cooperate for early disposal of the case, it will be open for the respondent to apply for cancellation of bail.

The appeal is accordingly allowed.”

(Emphasis supplied)

11. In **Arvind Walia Vs. Directorate of Enforcement & another,**
SLP(Crl.) No.2461 of 2026, the Hon’ble Supreme Court held as under:-

“7. We have taken note of the fact that prosecution complaint has already been filed by the ED and that the appellant (aged 65 years) has been in custody for over 8 months. We have also taken note of the fact that the appellant, prior to his arrest, physically appeared before the ED on five occasions. Presently, there seems to be no necessity to continue him in custody. What remains for consideration is the restrictions imposed by Section 45 of the PMLA, 2002.

8. Section 45 of the PMLA, 2002 cannot be interpreted to justify indefinite detention. In appropriate cases, the constitutional courts must intervene and have, in fact, intervened in the past to



CRM-M-55691-2025 (O&M)

-16-

safeguard the right to personal liberty of the accused under Article 21. The twin conditions under Section 45 cannot override the constitutional safeguards under Article 21 of the Constitution (see: Manish Sisodia v Enforcement Directorate, 2024 SCC OnLine SC 1920). Applying this principle, this Court has granted bail in appropriate cases irrespective of the period of custody.

9. In view of the above, we are of the considered opinion that further detention of the appellant pending trial is not necessary. The appeal, thus, deserves acceptance and the appellant may be admitted to an order for grant of bail.”

(Emphasis supplied)

12. Apparently, the conditions under Section 45 of the PMLA Act would not apply to the case of a woman in view of the order passed in **Shashi Bala @ Shashi Bala Singh** (supra). In the case of **Arvind Walia** (supra) even a man was granted the concession of bail after having been in custody for 08 months. In the instant case, the petitioner is a woman who has undergone more than 01 year of actual custody.

13. Keeping in view the period of custody undergone by the petitioner and the fact that the Trial is not likely to be concluded anytime soon, the further incarceration of the petitioner is not required.

14. Thus without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner-Dimple Kharour W/o Sukwhinder Singh Kharour is ordered to be released on bail subject to her furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned CJM/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

**CRM-M-55691-2025 (O&M)**

-17-

15. The petitioner shall appear before the office of the Directorate of Enforcement Zonal Office, The Mirage, Cool Road, Jalandhar, Punjab on the first Monday of every month till the conclusion of the Trial and inform in writing each time that she is not involved in any other crime other than the cases mentioned in this order.

16. The petitioner (or anyone on her behalf) shall prepare an FDR in the sum of Rs.5,00,000/- and deposit the same with the Trial Court. The same would be liable to be forfeited as per law in case of the absence of the petitioner from the trial without sufficient cause.

17. The petitioner shall surrender her passport forthwith (if not already surrendered) to the respondent/Directorate of Enforcement immediately and it shall not be released to her under any circumstances whatsoever without an application being moved in that regard before this Court.

18. The petition stands disposed of.

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE

10.04.2026

JITESH

Whether speaking/reasoned:- Yes/No**Whether reportable:- Yes/No**