



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

117

CRM-M-70780-2025
Decided on : 23.02.2026

Harpreet Kaur

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Shakti Mehta, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab
assisted by ASI Gurmeet Singh, No. 1884/Sangrur.

Mr. Ishan Gupta, Advocate and
Ms. Vrinda Katoch, Advocate, for the complainant(s).

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. In the present case, on 04.02.2026, following order was passed
by the Coordinate Bench of this Court:-

“ Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.0050 dated 06.04.2025, registered under Sections 420, 406, 120-B IPC, at Police Station Dirba, District Sangrur.

Status report has already been filed by the learned State counsel.

Brief facts as per the prosecution case are that the petitioner alongwith co-accused duped the complainant for an amount of Rs.15,00,000/- by entering into an agreement to sell by concealing the fact that the property in question was disputed and its alienation had been stayed by the civil Court.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the allegations levelled against the present petitioner are concocted and she has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is contended that even on a bare reading of the FIR, no specific role has been assigned to the petitioner. Learned counsel further submits that as per the contents of the FIR itself, the dispute in the present case is essentially civil in nature for which the complainant has already instituted civil proceedings by way of a suit for possession through specific performance of the alleged agreement to sell, and the present criminal proceedings are a clear attempt to give a criminal colour to a purely civil dispute. It is further submitted that prior to the registration of the present FIR, the petitioner was never associated by the police in any preliminary enquiry, nor was she ever called upon to join the investigation. Learned counsel submits that the petitioner has not received even a single penny from the complainant and there is nothing to be



recovered from her. The material relied upon by the prosecution is documentary in nature and already stands in the custody of the investigating agency. Co-accused Chajju Ram, Baldev Singh and Gurbhej Singh have been granted the ad-interim bail by the learned trial Court. It is further submitted that the petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation and undertakes to cooperate with the investigating agency in all respects. Hence, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required and the petitioner deserves the concession of anticipatory bail.

On the other hand, learned State counsel while referring to the status report, has opposed the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail, by submitting that the offence committed by the petitioner is serious in nature.

Learned counsel for the complainant, while opposing the petition for anticipatory bail, has contended that the petitioner has played an active role in the crime and, thus, does not deserve the concession of bail.

List on 23.02.2026

In the meantime, the petitioner is directed to join investigation within a week from today and would appear as and when required by the Investigating Officer and cooperate with the Investigating Agency. In the event of arrest, she shall be admitted to interim bail on furnishing of bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of Arresting/Investigating Officer. The petitioner shall also abide by the conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023.”

2. Continuing his submissions, learned counsel for the petitioner contends that in compliance of the order dated 04.02.2026, passed by the coordinate Bench of this Court, petitioner has joined the investigation, and has fully co-operated. Therefore, he prays for confirmation of the said interim anticipatory bail order.

3. Learned State counsel on instructions, confirms the said averment made by counsel for the petitioner of joining the investigation on 10.02.2026 by the petitioner, and submits that as of now, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required for the purpose of investigation.

4. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

5. Since, petitioner has already joined the investigation and custodial interrogation is no more required; ad-interim bail order dated 04.02.2026, passed by this Court is hereby made **absolute**. Accordingly, present petition is **allowed**.



However, petitioner shall continue to join the investigation as and when required to do so and abide by all the terms and conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023.

6. Accordingly, petition stands **disposed of**.

7. However, present order would be subject to the submission of passport of the petitioner to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if he possesses, within a period of one week from today. Otherwise, he would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that he does not possess any passport.

It is clarified that in case, aforesaid condition is not complied with, this order would be considered as *non est* automatically.

Pending misc. application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

February 23, 2026

J.Ram

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned:</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether Reportable:</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>