



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

209

CRM-M-31886-2025  
Decided on : 08.09.2025

Jaida

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana

. . . Respondent(s)

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH**

PRESENT: Mr. Nikhil Ghai, Advocate and  
Mr. Armaan Singh, Advocate  
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. PK Jhanda, Sr. DAG, Haryana  
assisted by ASI Dharmender No. 76/Nuh,  
P.S. Nagina, District Nuh.

Mr. Anmol Partap Singh Mann, Advocate  
for the complainant.

\*\*\*\*

**SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)**

1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438 Cr.P.C.), is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed here-under:-

Name of Petitioner (s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Jaida	21	30.01.2024	409, 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B of IPC, 1860	Nagina	Nuh

2. On 14.07.2025 following order was passed:-

“1. This is a petition for anticipatory bail filed under Section 482 of the Bhartiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in case FIR No.21 dated 30.01.2024 under Sections 409, 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B of the IPC, 1860, registered at Police Station Nagina, District Nuh.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the present petitioner during her term as a Sarpanch had embezzled an amount of Rs.7,57,716/-. It is stated that the recovery of the amount has been stayed by this Court vide order dated 08.02.2024 passed in CWP-2836-2024 (Annexure P-6).

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is ready to join investigation.



4. *Notice of motion for 08.09.2025.*
5. *On the asking of the Court Ms.Ankita Ahuja, AAG, Haryana accepts notice on behalf of the State.*
6. *At this stage, Mr.Anmol Partap Singh Mann, Advocate with Mr.Navjot Singh Sidhu, Advocate has entered appearance on behalf of the complainant-Gram Panchayat and opposed the grant of interim bail to the petitioner.*
6. *Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case and the fact that recovery has been stayed by this Court, in the meantime, the petitioner is directed to appear before the SHO/Investigating Officer to join investigation as and when required and in the event of her arrest, she shall be released on interim bail on her furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of SHO/Investigating Agency, subject to the following conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of the BNSS [erstwhile Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.]:-*
  - i) *that the petitioner shall make herself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;*
  - ii) *that the petitioner shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;*
  - iii) *that the petitioner shall not leave India without the prior permission of the Court;*
  - iv) *such other condition as may be imposed under sub-section (3) of Section 480, as if the bail were granted under that section.”*

3. Continuing his submissions, learned counsel for the petitioner contends that in compliance of the order dated 14.07.2025 passed by this Court, petitioner has joined the investigation, and has fully co-operated. Therefore, he prays for confirmation of the said interim anticipatory bail order.

4. Learned State counsel, on instructions, very fairly submits that the petitioner has joined investigation on 31.08.2025, in compliance with the directions passed by the Coordinate Bench of this Court, and that as of now, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required for the purpose of investigation.

However, since there is a stay order on the disputed embezzlement amount in proceedings before the Coordinate Bench of this Court in CWP No.2836 of 2024, wherein the next date of hearing is fixed for 20.01.2026, the said recovery cannot be effected.

5. Heard learned counsel for the parties.



6. In view of the fact that recovery of the embezzlement amount in question from the petitioner has already been stayed, as informed by learned State counsel, there is no justification for subjecting the petitioner to custodial interrogation. Accordingly, the ad-interim bail order dated 14.07.2025 passed by this Court is made absolute. The present petition is, thus, 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.

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

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

**(SANJAY VASHISTH)  
JUDGE**

**September 08, 2025**

*J.Ram*

*Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No*

*Whether Reportable: Yes/No*