

2026.PHHC.012207



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

304

CRM-M-69481-2025

Date of decision: 28<sup>th</sup> January, 2026

Gurmeet Kaur and others

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA**

Present: Ms. Damanpreet K. Brar, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Vivek Sharma, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab.

\*\*\*

**MANISHA BATRA, J (ORAL):-**

The present petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') by the petitioners seeking grant of anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No. 240 dated 16.09.2025 registered under Sections 329(3), 62, 305(a), 79 and 61(2) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNS') at Police Station Sohana, District SAS Nagar (Mohali).

2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of statement got recorded by the complainant Ambika Masih working as Additional Director and Legal Advisor in US Grace Logistics Pvt. Ltd. alleging that one Lakhwinder Singh husband of the petitioner No.2 was appointed as Additional Director in the above named company in the year 2022. On receipt of an income tax notice in November, 2023, Ramandeep Kaur, another director of

2026.PHHC.012207



the company asked Lakhwinder Singh to produce the income tax record of the company before her but instead of doing so, he initially made excuses and then stopped coming to the office of the company and even sent his resignation. On checking the record, it was found that he had misappropriated an amount of Rs. 1.30 crores belonging to the company by illegally transferring the same in the bank accounts of his family members/relatives. A case was got registered against him and he was taken into custody.

3. As per the further allegations, Lakhwinder Singh then entered into an agreement with the company for transferring a house bearing No. 1208 situated in Ansal API, Sector 114, Mohali in the name of the company and even possession of the same was handed over. However, sale deed was not got registered. The complainant alleged that thereafter, the family members of Lakhwinder Singh @ Lucky and Lalli Singh and another accused in the FIR lodged by them, started making attempts to illegally entered into the aforesaid house No. 1208. She alleged that on 13.09.2025, when mother and brother of Ramandeep Kaur, Director of the company were returning home, the accused Baldev Singh and Sanam along with two more persons violated them and extended threats. Then on 14.09.2025, Balwant Singh tried to break open the lock of house No. 1208. On the same night, he along with the present petitioner and some unknown persons broke open the locks of the house No. 1208. They were armed with deadly weapons. They caused damage to the house, committed theft of the documents kept therein and also removed DVR from the same. The matter was reported to the police.

2026.PHHC.012207



4. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. The petitioners were nominated as accused. Apprehending their arrest, they jointly moved an application for grant of anticipatory bail which was dismissed by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Mohali vide order dated 06.10.2025.

5. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioners that they have been falsely implicated in this case. In fact, a financial dispute was going on between Ramandeep Kaur and Lakhwinder Singh who were director and share holders respectively of the company. The agreement to sell regarding house No. 1208 was forcibly got executed by complainant from the accused Lakhwinder Singh @ Lucky and Lalli Singh. The complainant had taken illegal possession of the above mentioned house in an illegal manner. The matter stands amicably settled and complainant had executed an affidavit in favour of the petitioners. The petitioners are ready to comply with the terms and conditions to be imposed upon them. They are ready to join investigation. Their custodial interrogation is not required. No recovery is to be effected from them. It is, therefore, argued that the petition deserves to be allowed.

6. Status report has been filed. It is argued by learned State counsel that there are serious and specific allegations against the petitioners as by hatching a conspiracy with each other, they made an attempt to criminally trespass into the house given to the company of the complainant and tried to take unauthorized possession of the same, committed theft of the property and documents lying therein and also criminally intimidated the members of

2026.PHHC.012207



complainant party. For conducting thorough and proper investigation in the matter, for recovery of DVR of the cameras taken by the petitioners as well as the documents removed from the house No. 1208. Their custodial interrogation is must. No exceptional or extra ordinary circumstance for grant of anticipatory bail is made out. It is, therefore, argued that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

7. This Court has heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length.

8. The petitioners in connivance with each other had entered inside the house in possession of the company of the complainant and are further alleged to have removed the DVR installed in the same as well as the documents kept in the said house by the complainant and are further alleged to have caused damage to the said house. For the purpose of conducting thorough and proper investigation in the matter, the custodial interrogation of the petitioners is required. The case is at its nascent stage. In case their custodial interrogation is denied to the Investigating Agency, that will leave many glaring loopholes and gaps thereby adversely affecting the investigation. The powers under Section 482 of BNSS are to be exercised in extraordinary and sparing circumstances. In the present case, no such exceptional circumstances warranting exercise of the powers for grant of anticipatory bail by this Court are existing. As such, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petition does not deserve to be allowed. Accordingly, the same is dismissed.

2026.PHHC.012207



9. It is, however, clarified that the observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.
10. Since the main petition has been dismissed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

[MANISHA BATRA]  
JUDGE

28<sup>th</sup> January, 2026  
Parveen Sharma

- |                               |   |          |
|-------------------------------|---|----------|
| 1. Whether speaking/ reasoned | : | Yes / No |
| 2. Whether reportable         | : | Yes / No |