



CRM-M-68197-2025

-1-

(108)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-68197-2025

Date of decision :16.03.2026

VEENU PAREEK

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB & ANOTHER

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI

Present: Mr. V.P. Sangwan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. M.S. Toor, A.A.G., Punjab.

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J.

The prayer in the present petition under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 is for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.0265 dated 06.10.2025 registered under Sections 406 & 420 Ipc at Police Station City Rupnagar, District Rupnagar.

2. The present FIR came to be registered at the instance of Jyoti Pareek W/o Govind Sahai Pareek and the same reads as under:-

“Copy of complaint, complaint No.491-P, dated 18.06.2025 (ID-603067P, Office of the Senior Superintendent of Police, Rupnagar. To the Senior Superintendent of Police, Rupnagar, Punjab. Subject- Complaint against my daughter namely Veenu Pareek D/o Govind Sahai Pareek, R/o Green Woods HSG SOC, C-63, Keshavnagar-Mundwa, Pune City, Pune Maharashtra, 412307 having Ph. No.9730192573 for cheating fraud, mental torture & harassment, criminal breach of trust, usurp the property and money of complainant's husband during and after his death namely Govind Sahai Pareek



CRM-M-68197-2025

-2-

without intimating other legal heirs of the deceased i.e. complainant and his son and for taking wrongful gain and giving wrongful loss to the complainant and other legal heirs of the deceased husband of the complainant. Respected Sir/Ma'am, I, Jyoti Pareek W/o late Sh. Govind Sahai Pareek Aged about 76 years, R/o # 33, Railon Road Modal Town, Rupnagar, Punjab Pin Code 140001 having Ph. No.8699906661 needs to lodge a complaint against my daughter Veenu Pareek D/o Govind Sahai Pareek, in connection with serious criminal acts involving cheating, fraud, criminal breach of trust, and unauthorized financial transactions from the bank accounts of the deceased [Govind Sahai Pareek my late spouse] who passed away on 13/10/2023. Details are mentioned below:- 1. That I am the Legal heir of late Sh. Govind Sahai Pareek along with my son namely Boni Pareek @ Yuvraj Pareek and 2 daughters namely 1. Veenu Pareek, 2. Indu Pareek. 2. That after the death of Sh. Govind Sahai Pareek, it came to my knowledge that my younger daughter namely Veenu Pareek, without any legal authority or consent of the rightful legal heirs has gained unauthorized access to the bank account of my husband during his lifetime of ICICI bank, having its branch at Rupnagar, Punjab and has withdrawn/transferred a substantial amount of money amounting to Rs.85,00,000/- when he was alive and withdrawn/transferred a substantial amounts of money more than amounting Rs.45,00,000/- without any probate, succession certificate of legal authorization and without intimating any family member. 3. That my husband was not well since April 2023 and he was under treatment. My daughter Veenu came and took away my husband at Pune with the pretext of his treatment and after going there and without intimating my husband or anyone in family she took access of the bank accounts of my husband and immediately transferred



CRM-M-68197-2025

-3-

amount of Rs. 75,00,000/-(Seventy Five Lakh) on 02/06/2023. Not only this even after that she has done multiple transaction in her account without telling anyone. 4. That my husband's condition got worst but my daughter neither intimated me nor allowed me to see my husband and my husband got expired on 13/10/2023. My daughter even after refused for handing over us the death certificate of my husband. But with my efforts, I got the same. Copy of the death certificate is attached herewith. 5. That even after death of my husband, my daughter kept using the accounts of my husband. She has taken all amounts of the bank accounts (which are not even in the knowledge of the complainant), policies, mutual funds and other policies without intimating other legal heirs of my deceased husband. 6. That she is not even maintaining me or children of my sons as my son is not mentally fit and is unable to maintain himself. But my daughter has no mercy and has taken all the money of my husband fraudulently and without intimating anyone. Bank details are attached herewith in which there is also mention about policies. My in daughter has misused her position and breached our trust and has taken all amounts of my deceased husband, policies amounts, FDs etc which amounting to cheating, forgery, fraud and criminal breach of trust and she has taken wrongful benefit and has given us wrongful loss. 7. That now when we tried to contact her and demanding money of my deceased husband back and maintenance then she is abusing, threatening and using wrong words for me. Due to cheating of my daughter I am in financial crisis and not able to maintain myself. My daughter has deliberately concealed financial transactions from other legal heirs and has failed to account for the withdrawn amount till date. 8. That my daughter has high links with the police officials of Roopnagar hence I do not have trust on police officials of PS Roopnagar and kindly investigation of the



CRM-M-68197-2025

-4-

matter may kindly be conducted from CIA Staff. 9. That due to these bad acts and conducts we are suffering a lot as she has not intimated about the death of my husband in banks, policies departments and other financial department and till date she is withdrawing all money of my deceased husband on which she has no right. Hence please save us and take strict action against her for ditching us and giving us wrongful loss. Thanking you. Your sincerely, SD/-Jyoti Pareek(Jyoti Pareek W/o Govind Sahai Pareek). ”

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. In fact, the father of the petitioner who is the husband of the complainant was suffering from cancer and in May, 2023, the father of the petitioner started residing with the petitioner at Pune. The petitioner had cared for her father and had paid the fee and had borne other expenses of the children of her brother Boni Pareek @ Yuvraj Pareek who is disabled along with incurring other expenses from the Rs.75 lakhs her deceased father had transferred into her account. Approximately Rs.21 lakhs of the said Rs.75 lakhs have been accounted for as is apparent from the chart reproduced at page 8 of the petition. The affidavit of Indu Pareek, the real sister of the petitioner is on record as Annexure P-13 as per which the petitioner has not committed an offence and the dispute is of a civil nature. Since the petitioner is ready and willing to join investigation, she is entitled to the concession of anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned State counsel while referring to the status report dated 15.12.2025, contends that the petitioner has not



CRM-M-68197-2025

-5-

only cheated her mother but her handicapped brother namely, Boni Pareek @ Yuvraj Pareek. During the lifetime of Govind Sahai Pareek, the father of the petitioner and the husband of the complainant, the petitioner took advantage of the illness of her father and got transferred more than Rs.75 lakhs into her own bank accounts. Life insurance policies, mutual funds and other policies have been retained by the petitioner. Pursuant to the death of Govind Sahai Pareek, the petitioner has got transferred more than Rs.9 lakhs from the account of Govind Sahai Pareek into her accounts via UPI and other modes. Various amounts have also been withdrawn from the account of Govind Sahai Pareek through ATM after his death. This fact has been duly admitted by the petitioner in the chart reproduced at page 8 of the present petition. She has cheated and committed breach of trust with her mother and her handicapped brother. The custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required for recovery of the life insurance policies, mutual funds and other documents of the deceased which have been retained by her and also for taking the investigation to its logical conclusion. Further, as the offences is *prima facie* established, the petitioner is not entitled to the concession of anticipatory bail.

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

6. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Sumitha Pradeep Vs. Arun Kumar C.K. & Anr.*** **2022 Live Law (SC) 870** held that merely because custodial interrogation was not required by itself



CRM-M-68197-2025

-6-

could not be a ground to grant anticipatory bail. The first and the foremost thing the Court hearing the anticipatory bail application is to consider is the prima facie case against the accused. The relevant extract of the judgment is reproduced hereinbelow:-

“It may be true, as pointed out by learned counsel appearing for Respondent No.1, that charge-sheet has already been filed. It will be unfair to presume on our part that the Investigating Officer does not require Respondent No.1 for custodial interrogation for the purpose of further investigation.

Be that as it may, even assuming it a case where Respondent No.1 is not required for custodial interrogation, we are satisfied that the High Court ought not to have granted discretionary relief of anticipatory bail.

*We are dealing with a matter wherein the original complainant (appellant herein) has come before this Court praying that the anticipatory bail granted by the High Court to the accused should be cancelled. To put it in other words, the complainant says that the High Court wrongly exercised its discretion while granting anticipatory bail to the accused in a very serious crime like POCSO and, therefore, the order passed by the High Court granting anticipatory bail to the accused should be quashed and set aside. **In many anticipatory bail matters, we have noticed one common argument being canvassed that no custodial interrogation is required and, therefore, anticipatory bail may be granted. There appears to be a serious misconception of law that if no case for custodial interrogation is made out by the prosecution, then that alone would be a good ground to grant anticipatory bail.***



CRM-M-68197-2025

-7-

Custodial interrogation can be one of the relevant aspects to be considered along with other grounds while deciding an application seeking anticipatory bail. There may be many cases in which the custodial interrogation of the accused may not be required, but that does not mean that the prima facie case against the accused should be ignored or overlooked and he should be granted anticipatory bail. The first and foremost thing that the court hearing an anticipatory bail application should consider is the prima facie case put up against the accused. Thereafter, the nature of the offence should be looked into along with the severity of the punishment. Custodial interrogation can be one of the grounds to decline custodial interrogation. However, even if custodial interrogation is not required or necessitated, by itself, cannot be a ground to grant anticipatory bail.

7. A perusal of the FIR would reveal that the petitioner first got her cancer patient father to transfer Rs.75 lakhs to her account. Only a fraction of the same has been utilised for the treatment of her father even as per her own pleaded case. The bulk of the amount has been retained by the petitioner. Even pursuant to the death of her father, the petitioner has taken more than Rs.7 lakhs out of the bank account of her father through UPI transactions using the electronic device of her father and through ATM withdrawals. Therefore, not only as the petitioner committed offences under Section 406/420 IPC (Section 316 and 318 of BNS) but those under the IT Act as well for which further investigation is required. It is a case wherein the petitioner has committed offences

**CRM-M-68197-2025****-8-**

qua her mother Jyoti Pareek (complainant) and her handicapped brother Boni Pareek @ Yuvraj Pareek. FDs/life insurance policies/other policies have been retained by the petitioner. Apparently, the offence stand *prima facie* established. To take the investigation to its logical conclusion, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is certainly required to effect the recovery of various documents and for proper investigation.

8. In view of the aforementioned discussion, I find no merit in the present petition. Therefore, the same stands dismissed.

9. However, the observations made hereinabove are only for the purposes of deciding this bail petition and the Trial Court is free to adjudicate upon the matter on the basis of the evidence led before it uninfluenced by any such observations made herein.

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE

16.03.2026
JITESH

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