

2025:PHHC:092798



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

346

**CRM-M No.34157 of 2025
Date of decision: 24.07.2025**

Shreya Nagpal @ Shreya Sudan ... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present:- Mr. Sartej Singh Narula, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Sakshi Bakshi, AAG, Punjab,
for the respondent-State.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (For short "BNSS") seeking anticipatory bail in the FIR mentioned below:-

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
0189	18.10.2023	Khanna City-2, District Ludhiana	406, 420 and 120-B of IPC and 24 of the Emigration Act, 1983 (wrongly mentioned as Immigration Act in the FIR)

2. Brief facts relevant for the purpose of disposal of the present petition are that the aforementioned FIR has been registered on the basis of a complaint submitted by complainants Avtar Singh, Sukhjeet Singh

2025:PHHC:092798



and Buta Singh on the allegations that accused Sanjay Singh, his wife Arpana Sangotra and Kunal Nagpal and the petitioner who is wife of Kunal Nagpal were connected in the business of sending people abroad. The complainants came into contact with them in November 2020 on being introduced by Avtar Singh's friend Jagat Singh. The petitioner and co-accused represented to complainant Avtar Singh that they could send his family members and himself to Canada and for this, they demanded a sum of Rs.18 lakhs. Buta Singh and Sukhjeet Singh who were also desirous of giving abroad were asked to spend sum of Rs.12 lakhs and Rs.6 lakhs respectively for this purpose. Some days thereafter, the accused Sanjay Singh and Arpana Sangotra who are parents-in-law of the petitioner came to the victims and took their passports and other documents while assuring that they will procure a Permanent Residency and jobs for the victims and their family. The complainant Avtar Singh paid a sum of Rs.18 lakhs to the accused in November 2020, victim Sukhjeet Singh paid an amount of Rs.6 lakhs and victim Buta Singh paid an amount of Rs.12 lakhs to the accused on being induced by the accused persons, however, even after a long lapse of time, they were not sent to Canada nor their money was returned. When the complainants demanded the same, they were extended threats. As such, they prayed for taking action in the matter. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings have been initiated and are underway. Apprehending her arrest, the

2025:PHHC:092798



petitioner moved an application for grant of pre arrest bail which has been dismissed by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ludhiana vide order dated 02.06.2025.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that she has been falsely implicated in this case. She was married with accused Kunal Nagpal only on 18.02.2022. Their relations had become strained and she is residing separately since May 2023. She had no occasion to meet the complainants and induced them to part with any money on the pretext of sending them abroad since she was not even married with Kunal Nagpal at that time. She had no involvement in the financial dealings with the complainant party. Such dealings if any were between the accused Sanjay Singh and Arpana Sangotra who are her parents-in-law. She has no association with the proprietorship firm 'XENON LAW OFFICES' which is managed by the co-accused Arpana Sangotra. She has no ties or association with her in-laws since May 2023. She has been implicated in this case only because of the reason that she was married in the family of the co-accused. She is ready to join the investigation. Her custodial interrogation is not required. No recovery is to be effected from her. It is, therefore, argued that she deserves to be extended benefit of pre arrest bail.

4. Status report has been filed. It is argued by learned Assistant Advocate General, Punjab that the petitioner along with the co-accused

2025:PHHC:092798



who are members of her in-laws family had induced the complainants to part with a huge amount of money on the pretext of sending them to Canada on PR and to secure jobs for them and had caused wrongful loss to them. Her complicity in the crime is prima facie established. For conducting thorough investigation in the matter, the deeper probe is required to be conducted and for that purpose, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is must. Her role has been clearly emerged during the inquiry and investigation. It is, therefore, argued that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

5. This Court has considered the rival submissions.

6. The petitioner in connivance with her husband and parents-in-law is alleged to have cheated and committed offence of criminal breach of trust upon the complainants-victims Avtar Singh, Sukhjeet Singh and Buta Singh thereby inducing them to part with a sum of Rs.36 lakhs and is alleged to have dishonestly received the same from them on the pretext of facilitating them on immigration to Canada. She is named in the FIR. However, no specific attribution has been made to her. It is not in dispute that she was married with the co-accused Kunal Nagpal in February 2022 whereas the transaction of money is alleged to have taken place in November 2020 i.e. much prior to her marriage with the co-accused Kunal Nagpal. No money is alleged to have been handed over to the petitioner by the complainants-victims nor any transaction of money took

2025:PHHC:092798



place in her bank account. In these peculiar circumstances and given the nature of the allegations as levelled against the petitioner, this Court is of the considered opinion that the pre trial incarceration of the petitioner is not required. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be extended benefit of anticipatory bail, subject to her surrendering before the Investigating Officer/Arresting Officer within a period of ten days from the date of passing of this order and shall join investigation and on her surrender within that period, she shall be released on bail by the Investigating Officer/Arresting Officer on furnishing personal/surety bonds to its satisfaction and subject to the following conditions:-

- (i) the petitioner shall cooperate with the investigation and shall appear before the Investigating officer/Arresting officer as and when required.
- (ii) She 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 him/her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any Police Officer.
- (iii) She shall not leave the country without prior permission of the Court.
- (iv) She shall deposit her passport if any, with the jurisdiction Magistrate/trial Court.

2025:PHHC:092798



7. In case of violation of any of the above conditions, the jurisdictional Court shall be empowered to consider the application for cancellation, if any, and pass appropriate orders in accordance with law.
8. It is clarified that observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

24.07.2025
manju

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No