



CRM-M-69718-2025

1

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

(107)

CRM-M-69718-2025

DATE OF DECISION: 05.02.2026

Rajinder Kaur @ Rashi

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present Mr.Sidhant Bhosle, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr.Anup Singh, AAG, Punjab.
Mr. Ashish Yadav, Advocate,
with Mr. Yogesh Goel, Advocate,
for respondent no.2 – complainant.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J (ORAL)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 482 BNSS, 2023 seeking anticipatory bail to the petitioner in a case bearing FIR No.273 dated 18.11.2025, under Sections 406, 420 and 120-B IPC, registered at Police Station Sadar, Ludhiana, District Police Commissionerate, Punjab.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that initially the petitioner was employed with the accused company i.e. Y.B.G. Co., which was formed to develop a commercial project in Ludhiana, including world-class facilities such as S.C.O.s, shops, P.V.R., etc. In the said company, Gurjit Singh Grewal, a Canada-based N.R.I., was one of the Directors, and owned 50% of the company. Later, the petitioner quit her job as a receptionist with the company, and was working solely for the Director, Gurjit Singh Grewal. The petitioner is innocent, and has been caught in the



cross-fire in the dispute between the Directors of the company; a dispute arose between Gurjit Singh Grewal and other Directors, as 277 plots were sold, but no share of the profits accumulated therefrom were given to Gurjit Singh Grewal; consequently, Gurjit Singh Grewal filed a Civil Suit No.4666 of 2017 for rendition of accounts. Owing to the dispute, and to save his share, Gurjit Singh Grewal transferred some of the properties in the name of his daughter, Anjna Grewal, who later shifted to Canada; being his confidante, Gurjit Singh also transferred 10 properties in the name of the petitioner, which were later on transferred by the petitioner in the name of daughter of Gurjit Singh Grewal and placed on record the Sale Deed to support his contention; copy of the same is also provided to the learned counsel for the State. The entire matter revolves around non-fulfillment of contract by the Directors towards their investors, and the petitioner was merely a receptionist at the accused Company, and further, at the time the FIR was lodged, she was no longer an employee at the said Company, and was working independently for Director Gurjit Singh Grewal; the transfer of 10 properties in her name, was done only in confidence, and on asking of Gurjit Singh Grewal, which were later transferred by the petitioner to his daughter, and the petitioner stands nothing to gain out of the whole transaction. Present petitioner has nothing to do with the dispute between the Directors and she is not a beneficiary and is ready to join the investigation.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for the complainant contended that 10 properties have been transferred in the name of the present petitioner without any consideration.



Even though she later transferred the 10 properties to the daughter of Director Gurjit Singh Grewal, however, the 10 properties were initially transferred illegally as the properties belong to the investors. Total 150 people are affected due to these acts and conducts of Gurjit Singh and the present petitioner, and thus caused delay in handing over and completion of the projects. Upon specific query as to reply filed by the State, which does not state the action taken against the other Directors of the Company, Ltd. State Counsel submitted that their statements have been recorded, and the inquiry is underway, and further submitted that as per the statements of the other Directors, before transferring of properties, consent of other Directors was required, and such consent was not obtained by Gurjit Singh Grewal before transferring the properties to the present petitioner. Even though the properties were later transferred to daughter of Gurjit Singh, petitioner was hand in glove with Gurjit Singh Grewal in his actions, which consequently caused loss to the investors. Ld. State Counsel prayed for dismissal of the present petition seeking bail to the present petitioner as the matter requires an in-depth probe, and custodial interrogation of the petitioner is imperative for proper investigation of the case.

4. Learned counsel for the complainant also argued that if for the sake of arguments it is taken that she has 'reverted' the property she ought to have reverted the property to the company and not to the daughter of the petitioner and prayed for dismissal of the present petition.

5. Heard.

6. As per the fact of the case and contentions of learned counsel for the parties, it transpires that the matter involves a dispute between the



Directors regarding completion of the project and handing over of the possession to the investor. The allegations against the present petitioner are that 10 properties were illegally transferred in her name by Director Gurjit Singh Grewal by not following the regulations, and as per the admitted fact that same was later on transferred to the daughter; the properties belonged to the complainant/investors, who invested in this project, who have been affected by the non-delivery of possession of plots as they were illegally transferred to the petitioner, who further transferred it to the daughter of Director Gurjit Singh Grewal. So, taking into consideration the whole dispute, as custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required for proper investigation and for collection of evidence, anticipatory bail cannot be granted to the petitioner in view of law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in case titled as *State Represented by the C.B.I. v. Anil Sharma, 1997(7) SCC 187*, wherein the importance of custodial interrogation was emphasized, by holding that useful information and concealed materials may be elicited from a suspect in custody, than a suspect who is well-protected by anticipatory bail, wherein interrogation may be reduced to a mere ritual.

7. Anticipatory bail is an extra-ordinary relief which can be granted only in exceptional cases deserving of the concession, and is to be granted sparingly. Recently, Hon'ble Apex Court in *Srikant Upadhyay v. State of Bihar, 2024 INSC 202*, reiterated that anticipatory bail is an extraordinary and discretionary relief, not a matter of rule. Its grant must depend on the facts and circumstances of each case and be exercised with great caution and judicial restraint, as premature protection may impede



CRM-M-69718-2025 5

investigation, cause tampering with evidence, and result in a miscarriage of justice.

8. In view of the above, this Court finds no ground to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner and the present petition stands dismissed.

9. Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed to be an expression of opinion by this Court lest it may prejudice the trial.

05.02.2026
mamta

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

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