

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

2026:PHHC:041751



107

CRM-M-69075-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision:17.03.2026

Jagmeet Singh @ Meeta

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

... Respondent

2. CRM-M-68902-2025

Lakhveer Kaur @ Veerpal Kaur @ Lakhvir Kaur

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Nirmaljeet Singh Sidhu, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Roshandeep Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Jaskaran Singh, Advocate for

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

...

Manisha Batra, J. (Oral).

1. This common order shall dispose of **CRM-M-69075-2025 (Jagmeet Singh @ Meeta Vs. State of Punjab)** and **CRM-M-68902-2025 (Lakhveer Kaur @ Veerpal Kaur @ Lakhvir Kaur Vs. State of Punjab)** as both these petitions have been filed by the petitioners seeking benefit of anticipatory bail in case arising out of FIR No.240, dated 05.10.2025, registered under Sections 318(4), 316(2) and 61(2) of the BNS, at Police

Station Talwandi Sabo, District Bathinda.

2. As per the allegations, the petitioner(s), who are related to complainant – Jaswant Singh, by hatching a conspiracy with co-accused Gurtej Singh @ Teji and Sikanderpal Kaur, represented to the complainant, who was unmarried that they were running a marriage bureau and could get him married with accused Paramjit Kaur, whose photograph was shown by them to the complainant and his mother. They induced the complainant to part with a sum of Rs.1.50 lakhs for the purpose of fixing his matrimonial alliance. On 07.11.2024, all of them took the mother of the complainant to the house of accused Nikka Baba where Paramjit Kaur was shown to her. The petitioner and co-accused by exerting pressure upon the complainant and his mother to the effect that some prohibited days would start w.e.f. 09.11.2024, convinced them to perform marriage of the complainant with Paramjit Kaur on 08.11.2024. The complainant and his family members had agreed to the same. On 08.11.2024, when they went to the house of Nikka Baba where the marriage was to be performed, they were made to pay an amount of Rs.1.50 lakhs. Thereafter, in pursuance of some pre-plan, the petitioners exerted pressure upon the family of the complainant to part with another amount of Rs.1 lakh, which was given by the brother of the complainant to them. However, thereafter instead of performing *Anand Karj* ceremony, they made the complainant to take Paramjit Kaur with him by simply putting some necklace in her neck. Paramjit Kaur came to his house. The complainant's family was made to give a gold necklace weighing 4.5 tolas belonging to the sister of the complainant to Paramjit Kaur for wearing purposes. However, she stayed with the complainant only for 3-4 days and

thereafter left his house by making excuses while taking away gold ornament belonging to the sister of the complainant, cell phone and clothing etc. and she did not return back. Having realized that he and his family members had been cheated, the complainant prayed for taking action in the matter.

3. After registration of the FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated and are underway. Apprehending their arrest, the petitioners moved a joint application for grant of pre-arrest bail, which has been dismissed by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Bathinda vide common order dated 27.11.2025.

4. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner(s) that they have been falsely implicated in this case. After performing *Chunni Charawa* ceremony between the complainant and Paramjit Kaur, they had started residing together and had cohabited with each other. No money had been given to the petitioners, by the complainant who is their relative. The ingredients for commission of offences for which they have been booked, are not attracted qua them. They are ready to join the investigation. No recovery is to be effected from them. Their custodial interrogation is not required. It is, therefore, argued that they deserve to be extended the benefit of pre-arrest bail.

5. Per contra, learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for the complainant has argued that the allegations against the petitioners are quite serious and specific in nature. Infact, the petitioners by hatching a well thought out conspiracy, allured the complainant to perform marriage with Paramjit Kaur, had extracted a sum of Rs.2.5 lakhs, gold ornament weighing

4.5 tolas and cell phone from him and had sent co-accused Paramjit Kaur with him without performing all the necessary rituals for performance of a valid *Anand Karaj*/marriage ceremony and on the pretext of performing of the *Chunni Charawa* ceremony while fully knowing that no valid marriage had been performed between the complainant and Paramjit Kaur and only with an intent to cause wrongful loss of money to him. It is further argued that for the purpose of conducting a thorough and proper investigation into the matter and for recovery of the money and gold ornaments etc., custodial interrogation of the petitioners, is required. No extraordinary or exceptional circumstance to exercise powers for grant of pre-arrest bail is made out. It is, therefore, stressed that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

6. This Court has heard the rival submissions made by learned counsel for the parties.

7. The petitioners are alleged to have allured the complainant to initially part with a sum of Rs.1.5 lakhs on the premise of getting him married with accused Paramjit Kaur and in pursuance of the conspiracy so hatched by them, another amount of Rs.1 lakh had been extracted from the complainant's family. Accused Paramjit Kaur was sent to the house of the complainant without performing of the necessary rituals of marriage and she after staying for a short while, had left the house of the complainant with some gold ornament etc. The allegations make out a *prima facie* case for commission of the subject offences against the petitioners. For the purpose of conducting deeper and thorough probe, custodial interrogation of the petitioners is must. It is well settled proposition of law that powers for grant of anticipatory bail should be exercised in exceptional and extraordinary

circumstances and not in routine manner. No such circumstance, however, has been made out in this case. If the petitioners are given the shield of anticipatory bail that shall leave many glaring loopholes and gaps, thereby adversely affecting the investigation. The Court is also required to see that an order of anticipatory bail does not operate as inroad in the normal legal procedure of criminal cases by the trial Court. Accordingly, finding no compelling ground to allow the petitions, the same are dismissed.

8. It is, however, clarified that observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

9. Since the main petition(s) have been dismissed, pending application(s), if any, is rendered infructuous.

17.03.2026

harjeet

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

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE