



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

210

**CRM-M-59976-2024  
Reserved on : 25.02.2025  
Pronounced on: 05.03.2025**

Sonika Sharma

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

. . . Respondent(s)

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

PRESENT: Mr. Jasdeep Singh Salooja, Advocate  
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Amandeep Singh, DAG, Punjab.

\*\*\*\*

**SANJAY VASHISTH, J.**

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 hereunder:-

Name & age of Petitioner (s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Sonika Sharma, aged about 34 years	0153	29.07.2024	108 of BNS, 2023	Khanna City-2	Khanna

2. Complainant – Yogesh Sharma (father-in-law of the petitioner) got lodged the aforementioned FIR by recording the facts that his son Gaurav Sharma, aged 36 years, performed marriage with Sonika Sharma (petitioner herein) on 28.01.2019. Gaurav Sharma was working as Project Manager in IT Company at NOIDA, and he had left home on 02.07.2024, without informing anyone, in his car bearing registration No. DL-9CU-3253, make Honda City. On 03.07.2024, a call was received by the complainant,



informing him that Gaurav Sharma was found near Khanna in the car, after consuming poisonous medicine and is in unconscious condition, but later on, died in Civil Hospital, Khanna. On 04.07.2024, complainant – Yogesh kumar along with petitioner – Sonika Sharma and other relatives reached Khanna, and there statement of the petitioner was recorded under Section 194 of BNSS, 2023. Dead body was cremated on 05.07.2024. In the FIR, complainant also got recorded that his son Gaurav Sharma had typed a message from his Mobile No.98111-09071, and had sent it to his Mobile No.98111-53307. Message was in Hindi language, which is also mentioned in FIR. The same is also reproduced here-under in extracted form:-

*“ I am writing this with full consciousness, I am writing that I am upset with Sonika. Her only wish has been from five years that I should shift my mother to some old age home. I am tired of making her understand one thing that mom’s mental state is not right but she is not understanding this thing”...*

In the end, it is also mentioned that;

*“I want a bit of rest, I am sitting in the car, sending the location”*

Complainant handed-over the printed copy of the message along with mobile phone of his son ‘Gaurav Sharma’.

3. Petitioner’s counsel argues that the marriage of the petitioner and deceased ‘Gaurav Sharma’ was performed on 28.01.2019 and from the said wedlock, a child was born on 14.01.2021, and another female child was also born on 20.09.2023, and both the children are staying with their mother i.e. petitioner herein. Further submits that as per the allegations, ‘Gaurav Sharma’ had left the house on 02.07.2024 and the alleged suicide was



committed on 03.07.2024. Subsequently, dead body was cremated on 05.07.2024, but by that time, no complaint or any nature was moved by the complainant to the police.

It is for the first time on 29.07.2024, the present case i.e. FIR No.153, dated 29.07.2024, was registered under Section 108 of BNS, 2023, in which, petitioner has been made accused at the instance of her father-in-law.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner further argues that the essential ingredients of Section 107 of BNS, 2023 (equivalent to Section 107 of IPC) are not fulfilled, and therefore, there is no abetment on the part of the petitioner. As such, the petitioner cannot be held liable for the suicidal act committed by her husband, Gaurav Sharma.

He further submits that while there may have been occasional family disputes between the deceased and the petitioner, such quarrels do not imply that if one spouse commits suicide, the other should automatically be held responsible for the act, which is an independent and unlawful decision of the deceased.

Moreover, had there been any significant and serious issue between the petitioner and the deceased, the complainant could have taken immediate steps and lodged a report soon after learning about the death of his son, Gaurav Sharma. However, in this case, the FIR has been lodged after a considerable delay of approximately 25–26 days. This delay suggests that the FIR may have been registered with manipulation and ulterior motive, just to oust the petitioner from her matrimonial home by shifting the blame of her husband's death upon her.

5. In the second limb of the argument, petitioner's counsel argues



that even if the allegations, which are tried to be established from the mobile message are accepted to be true and correct, it cannot be assumed that it was only, the petitioner, who was responsible for the act of suicide committed by her husband. The legal recourse is always there to find out the solution or to come out of the problems.

Emotional or mental weakness or any kind of work pressure or social pressure, if any exists, someone else, who is staying with such a person cannot be held responsible for an independent and unlawful act of the person like the husband of the petitioner, who committed suicide.

Besides, the solitary evidence of mobile message is not an acceptable, because same is not admissible at this stage, un-till same is authenticated with a certificate required under Section 65 of the Evidence Act.

6. Counsel further points out that there is no instance of moving of any complaint before any authority or police before the death of her husband, in regard to the family disputes arising during the period of last about more than 05 years. Even staying of both the children along with their mother (petitioner herein) is enough to assume that the behaviour as projected by the complainant through alleged suicide note is so cruel or irreparable.

7. In support of his submissions, counsel relies upon the following judgments rendered by Hon'ble the Apex Court and by this Court:-

- (i) *Rohini Sudarshan Gangurde v. The State of Maharashtra & Anr., 2024(4) RCR (Criminal) 165;*
- (ii) *Criminal Appeal No.221 of 2025 (@ Special Leave Petition (Crl.) No. 11868 of 2023), titled as, "Mahendra Awase v. The State of Madhya Pradesh" (D.O.D. : 17.01.2025) : 2025 INSC*



76;

- (iii) *Prakash and others v. The State of Maharashtra and another, 2025(1) RCR (Criminal) 244 : Law Finder Doc Id #2675945;*
- (iv) *A.R. Madhav Rao and others v. State of Haryana and another, 2018(3) AICLR 451 : Law Finder Doc Id #1090866.*

8. With the help of the judgments cited above, counsel submits that petitioner is a woman and her custodial interrogation would not serve any useful purpose to the prosecution, more for the reason that nothing material is to be recovered from her possession.

Further submits that once the petitioner is herself ready to join investigation and to fully cooperate with the investigating agency, she is entitled for the concession of anticipatory bail and accordingly, prays for the same.

9. On the other hand, while strongly opposing the contentions of the petitioner's counsel, learned State counsel submits that during the course of investigation, on 04.12.2024, a supplementary statement of complainant was recorded, who had received a text message from his son, Gaurav Sharma on 02.07.2024 at 09:00/09:30 PM. Complainant also produced screen shot of the message of Gaurav Sharma (deceased).

Learned State counsel refers the reproduction part of the said message, as reproduced in paragraph No.4 of the status report, and thereupon, submits that there was no alternative situation for the deceased and under compelling circumstances, he had to commit suicide after falling under tremendous pressure due to unbearable behaviour of his wife (petitioner herein).

For convenience, the message sent by the deceased – Gaurav



Sharma and relied upon by the prosecution is referred in paragraph No.4 of the status report and same is reproduced here-under in extracted form:-

*“ I am writing this with a clear mind.*

*I am completely frustrated with Sonika. For the past five years, her only desire has been that I shift my parents to an old age home or somewhere far away.*

*I am tired of explaining to her that my mother’s mental state is not well, but she refuses to understand this. I am exhausted by her constant quarrels. There hasn’t been a single festival where she hasn’t created a scene.*

*Even when we have to go somewhere, a conflict is inevitable. I can no longer tolerate this.*

*If I go somewhere, an argument is bound to happen. If we visit someone’s house, a fight is certain. If someone visits our home, it’s the same story.*

*When my father was admitted to the hospital, she caused unnecessary disputes. When my mother was admitted, she created major chaos at home, questioning why I was going to the hospital.*

*When my uncle had an accident, even on that day, she quarrelled.*

*During the three deaths in the family, on all three occasions, she argued about why I spent so much time there and why I was going to Haridwar.*

*Two nights ago, when my mother was unwell, my father called me. She locked the room that night and told me to stay with my parents, causing unnecessary drama.*

*These are just a few small examples; there are so many incidents that I cannot list them all.*

*Now, my patient has completely run out.*

*It is absolutely true that if a wife is understanding, the home is heaven, otherwise, it is hell.*

*If, these days, women want husbands who live alone and are not family-oriented, they should find orphaned men.*

*I know that after I am gone, a mountain of troubles will fall upon everyone, but I have no other option now. My children, forgive me, your mother wants to live alone. It is not my fault, but I am now exhausted.*



*Sonika, you were never less important to me, but taking care of my parents is also my responsibility. I am tired of trying to make you understand this.*

*Please show this letter to Sonika's parents.*

*Now I want some peace. I am sitting in the car and sending my location.”*

Thus, learned State counsel submits that petitioner does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail.

10. I have gone through the pleadings of the petition and the documents appended thereto, along with, status report filed by the State.

11. After hearing arguments from both the sides, and by taking note of the alleged suicide note/WhatsApp message, a *prima facie* view can be framed that marriage life of the petitioner and her husband (deceased in the present case) was not running in smooth manner. From the message, as relied upon by the prosecution, it appears that the deceased was more perturbed with the unwarranted desire of the petitioner, whereby, she had been insisting to reside separately from her parents-in-law.

Undoubtedly, there must be some reasons behind it, such as, disliking of each other along with temperamental issues. In the said suicide note, it does not come out that when in recent past any serious fight/altercation took place between the petitioner and her husband or which act had instigated the deceased to commit suicide.

12. In *Rohini Sudarshan Gangurde's case (supra)*, husband of the petitioner – wife therein, had committed suicide and the Hon'ble Apex Court while dealing with the application for discharge, noticed as under:-

*“9. In S.S. Chheena v. Vijay Kumar Mahajan, (2010) 12 SCC 190, this court explained the concept of abetment along with necessary ingredient for offence under Section 306 of IPC as under:*



“25. Abetment involves a mental process of instigating a person or intentionally aiding a person in doing of a thing. Without a positive act on the part of the (2010) 12 SCC 190 accused to instigate or aid in committing suicide, conviction cannot be sustained. The intention of the legislature and the ratio of the cases decided by this Court is clear that in order to convict a person under Section 306 IPC there has to be a clear mens rea to commit the offence. It also requires an active act or direct act which led the deceased to commit suicide seeing no option and that act must have been intended to push the deceased into such a position that he committed suicide.”

10. In **Amalendu Pal v. State of W.B., (2010) 1 SCC 707**, this court explained the parameters of Section 306 in following words:

“12. Thus, this Court has consistently taken the view that before holding an accused guilty of an offence under Section 306 IPC, the court must scrupulously examine the facts and circumstances of the case and also assess the evidence adduced before it in order to find out whether the cruelty and harassment meted out to the victim had left the victim with no other alternative but to put an end to her life. It is also to be borne in mind that in cases of alleged abetment of suicide there must be proof of direct or indirect acts of incitement to the commission of suicide. Merely on the allegation of harassment without there being any positive action proximate to the time of occurrence on the part of the (2010) 1 SCC 707 accused which led or compelled the person to commit suicide, conviction in terms of Section 306 IPC is not sustainable.

13. In order to bring a case within the purview of Section 306 IPC there must be a case of suicide and in the commission of the said offence, the person who is said to have abetted the commission of suicide must have played an active role by an act of instigation or by doing certain act to facilitate the commission of suicide. Therefore, the act of abetment by the person charged with the said offence must be proved and established by the prosecution before he could be convicted under Section 306 IPC.”

11. In **Ramesh Kumar v. State of Chhattisgarh, (2001) 9 SCC 618**, while explaining the meaning of ‘Instigation’, this court stated that:

“20. Instigation is to goad, urge forward, provoke, incite or encourage to do “an act”. To satisfy the requirement of “instigation”, though it is not necessary that actual words must be used to that effect or what constitutes “instigation” must necessarily and specifically be suggestive of the consequence. Yet a reasonable certainty to incite the consequence must be capable of being spelt out. Where the accused had, by his acts or omission or by a continued (2001) 9 SCC 618. course of conduct, created such circumstances that the deceased was left with no other option except to commit suicide, in which case, an “instigation” may have to be inferred. A word uttered in a fit of anger or emotion without intending the consequences to actually follow, cannot be said to be instigation.”

12. These principles and necessary ingredients of Section 306 and 107 of Indian Penal Code were reiterated and summarized by this court



in recent case of *Gurucharan Singh vs State of Punjab, (2020) 10 SCC 200*.

13. After carefully considering the facts and evidence recorded by the courts below and the legal position established through statutory and judicial pronouncements, we are of the view that there is no proximate link between the marital dispute in the marriage of deceased with appellant and the commission of suicide. The prosecution has failed to collect any evidence to substantiate the allegations against the appellant. The appellant has not played any active role or any positive or direct act to instigate or aid the deceased in committing suicide. Neither the statement of the complainant nor that of the colleagues of the deceased as recorded by the Investigating Officer during investigation suggest any kind of instigation by the appellant to abet the commission of suicide. There is no allegation against the appellant of suggesting the deceased to commit suicide at any time prior to the commission of suicide by her husband.”

Similarly, in *Mahendra Awase's case (supra)*, in para No.20, the

Hon'ble Apex Court, observed as under:-

“20. This Court has, over the last several decades, repeatedly reiterated the higher threshold, mandated by law for Section 306 IPC [Now Section 108 read with Section 45 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023] to be attracted. They however seem to have followed more in the breach. Section 306 IPC appears to be casually and too readily resorted to by the police. While the persons involved in genuine cases where the threshold is met should not be spared, the provision should not be deployed against individuals, only to assuage the immediate feelings of the distraught family of the deceased. The conduct of the proposed accused and the deceased, their interactions and conversations preceding the unfortunate death of the deceased should be approached from a practical point of view and not divorced from day-to-day realities of life. Hyperboles employed in exchanges should not, without anything more, be glorified as an instigation to commit suicide. It is time the investigating agencies are sensitised to the law laid down by this Court under Section 306 so that persons are not subjected to the abuse of process of a totally untenable prosecution. The trial courts also should exercise great caution and circumspection and should not adopt a play it safe syndrome by mechanically framing charges, even if the investigating agencies in a



*given case have shown utter disregard for the ingredients of Section 306.”*

Furthermore, in *Prakash and others case (supra)*, the Hon’ble Apex Court, observed as under:-

*“23. In the case of Sanju @ Sanjay Singh Sengar (supra), the appellant before this Court was charged with having abetted the suicide by his brother-in-law (sister’s husband). The prosecution story was that there were strained relations between the deceased and his wife who at the material time was staying with the appellant therein. On 25th July, 1998 the deceased went to the appellant to bring back his wife. There was a quarrel between the appellant and the deceased who came back alone. The deceased told his brothers and other acquaintances that the appellant had threatened and abused him by using filthy words. On 27th July, 1998 the deceased was found dead. The deceased left a suicide note which showed his disturbed state of mind but otherwise he blamed the appellant for the suicide. The appellant’s petition for quashing of the charge-sheet filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. was dismissed by the High Court which led him to file an appeal before this Court which came to be allowed. While taking note of the disturbed state of mind of the deceased as was evident from the suicide note and the lack of intention on the part of the accused to abet the commission of suicide by the deceased, the Court held that there was a time gap of 48 hours between the abusive language being used and the commission of suicide. As such, owing to the passage of 48 hours, giving the deceased enough time to reflect, there was no proximate link between the words uttered and the act of suicide. This Court observed as follows:*

*“8. In Swamy Prahaladdas v. State of M.P. [1995 Supp (3) SCC 438 : 1995 SCC (Cri) 943] the appellant was charged for an offence under Section 306 IPC on the ground that the appellant during the quarrel is said to have remarked to the deceased “to go and die”. This Court was of the view that mere words uttered by the accused to the deceased “to go and die” were not even prima facie enough to instigate the deceased to commit suicide.*

*9. In Mahendra Singh v. State of M.P. [1995 Supp (3) SCC 731 : 1995 SCC (Cri) 1157] the appellant was charged for an offence under Section 306 IPC basically based upon the dying declaration of the deceased, which reads as under: (SCC p. 731, para 1)*

*“My mother-in-law and husband and sister-in-law (husband's elder brother's wife) harassed me. They beat me and abused me. My husband Mahendra wants to marry a second time. He has illicit connections with my sister-in-law. Because of these reasons and being harassed I want to*



*die by burning.”*

10. This Court, considering the definition of “abetment” under Section 107 IPC, found that the charge and conviction of the appellant for an offence under Section 306 is not sustainable merely on the allegation of harassment of the deceased. This Court further held that neither of the ingredients of abetment are attracted on the statement of the deceased.

11. In **Ramesh Kumar v. State of Chhattisgarh [(2001) 9 SCC 618]** this Court was considering the charge framed and the conviction for an offence under Section 306 IPC on the basis of dying declaration recorded by an Executive Magistrate, in which she had stated that previously there had been quarrel between the deceased and her husband and on the day of occurrence she had a quarrel with her husband who had said that she could go wherever she wanted to go and that thereafter she had poured kerosene on herself and had set herself on fire. Acquitting the accused this Court said: (SCC p. 620)

“A word uttered in a fit of anger or emotion without intending the consequences to actually follow cannot be said to be instigation. If it transpires to the court that a victim committing suicide was hypersensitive to ordinary petulance, discord and differences in domestic life quite common to the society to which the victim belonged and such petulance, discord and differences were not expected to induce a similarly circumstanced individual in a given society to commit suicide, the conscience of the court should not be satisfied for basing a finding that the accused charged for abetting the offence of suicide should be found guilty.”

12. Reverting to the facts of the case, both the courts below have erroneously accepted the prosecution story that the suicide by the deceased is the direct result of the quarrel that had taken place on 25-7-1998 wherein it is alleged that the appellant had used abusive language and had reportedly told the deceased “to go and die”. For this, courts relied on a statement of Shashi Bhushan, brother of the deceased, made under Section 161 CrPC when reportedly the deceased, after coming back from the house of the appellant, told him that the appellant had humiliated him and abused him with filthy words. The statement of Shashi Bhushan, recorded under Section 161 CrPC is annexed as Annexure P-3 to this appeal and going through the statement, we find that he has not stated that the deceased had told him that the appellant had asked him “to go and die”. Even if we accept the prosecution story that the appellant did tell the deceased “to go and die”, that itself does not constitute the ingredient of “instigation”. The word “instigate” denotes incitement or urging to do some drastic or inadvisable action or to stimulate or incite. Presence of mens rea, therefore, is the necessary concomitant of instigation. It is common knowledge that the words uttered in a quarrel or on the spur of the moment cannot be taken to be uttered with mens rea. It is in a fit of anger and emotion. Secondly, the alleged abusive words, said to have been told to the deceased were on 25-7-1998 ensued by a quarrel. The deceased was found hanging on 27-7-1998. Assuming that the deceased had taken the abusive language seriously, he had enough time in between to think over and reflect and, therefore, it cannot be said that the abusive language, which had been used by the appellant on 25-7-1998 drove the deceased to commit suicide. Suicide by the deceased on 27-7-1998 is not proximate to the abusive language uttered by the appellant on 25-7-1998. The fact that the deceased committed suicide on 27-7-1998 would itself clearly point out that it is not the direct result of



*the quarrel taken place on 25- 7-1998 when it is alleged that the appellant had used the abusive language and also told the deceased to go and die. This fact had escaped notice of the courts below.*

.....

14. *A plain reading of the suicide note would clearly show that the deceased was in great stress and depressed. One plausible reason could be that the deceased was without any work or avocation and at the same time indulged in drinking as revealed from the statement of the wife Smt Neelam Sengar. He was a frustrated man. Reading of the suicide note will clearly suggest that such a note is not the handiwork of a man with a sound mind and sense. Smt Neelam Sengar, wife of the deceased, made a statement under Section 161 CrPC before the investigation officer. She stated that the deceased always indulged in drinking wine and was not doing any work. She also stated that on 26-7-1998 her husband came to them in an inebriated condition and was abusing her and other members of the family. The prosecution story, if believed, shows that the quarrel between the deceased and the appellant had taken place on 25-7-1998 and if the deceased came back to the house again on 26-7-1998, it cannot be said that the suicide by the deceased was the direct result of the quarrel that had taken place on 25- 7-1998. Viewed from the aforesaid circumstances independently, we are clearly of the view that the ingredients of “abetment” are totally absent in the instant case for an offence under Section 306 IPC. It is in the statement of the wife that the deceased always remained in a drunken condition. It is common knowledge that excessive drinking leads one to debauchery. It clearly appeared, therefore, that the deceased was a victim of his own conduct unconnected with the quarrel that had ensued on 25- 7-1998 where the appellant is stated to have used abusive language. Taking the totality of materials on record and facts and circumstances of the case into consideration, it will lead to the irresistible conclusion that it is the deceased and he alone, and none else, is responsible for his death.” (emphasis supplied)”*

Additionally, the Single Bench of this High Court in **A.R.**

**Madhav Rao’s case (supra)**, noticed in paragraphs No.23, 24 & 25, as

under:-

“23. *Generally, the person who commits suicide used to/liked to leave a suicide note naming certain person as responsible for his committing suicide. Merely because a person has been so named in the suicide note one cannot immediately jump to the conclusion that he is an offender under Section 306 I.P.C.*

24. *The contents of the suicide note and other attending circumstances have to be examined to find out whether it is abetment within the meaning of Section 306 I.P.C. read with Section 107 I.P.C. There may be a case where in the suicide note victim had named a person, who is*



*responsible for his committing suicide, but, on proper analysis, Section 306 I.P.C. may not be attracted to him.*

25. *The overall analysis is required to be examined with the following incidents like if a lover commits suicide due to love failure, if a student commits suicide because of his poor performance in the examination, a client commits suicide because his case is dismissed, the lady, examiner, lawyer respectively cannot be held to have abetted the commission of suicide. For the wrong decision taken by a coward, fool, idiot, a man of weak mentality, a man of frail mentality, another person cannot be blamed as having abetted his committing suicide. In the present case, the suicide note shows that deceased Iqbal Asif Khan is stated to have compelled himself to prepare draft and presenting petition before the Allahabad High Court which was against the interest of the company to that extent he had assumed the things. Consequently, company would be put into loss and members of the family would be affected, for this kind of statement in the suicide note, petitioners cannot be blamed. The conclusion would be deceased – Iqbal Asif Khan died like a coward. Instead of protecting the family, he perished like an unsuccessful man in life foolishly. For this, how can the petitioners be directly blamed. In the absence of any specific instigation by the petitioners to the extent that they have advised or suggested or compelled the deceased Iqbal Asif Khan to prepare draft and presenting petition against the interest of the company. Merely because a person who has committed suicide, has left a suicide note immediately one cannot jump to a conclusion that it is enough to mulct the accused with criminal liability under Section 306 IPC. One has to analyse and examine the contents of the suicide note to find out whether it contains any incriminating information in the nature of instigation, provocation, forcing the victim to commit suicide.”*

13. It is yet to be ascertained by the Court whether there was any interaction or conversation preceding the unfortunate death in this case.

Undoubtedly, collection of evidence during the investigation and its subsequent proving before the trial court will play a crucial role in determining the facts.

14. It would also be examined whether the deceased, took a drastic step of finishing his life due to the regular and constant instigation of the



petitioner or same was the result of weakness of his own mental health. Because in the Single Bench judgment of this Court rendered in *A.R. Madhav Rao's case (supra)*, a situation has been dealt with, whether on taking a wrong decision taken by the coward, fool, idiot, a man of weak mentality, someone else can be blamed for it or not ?

All the aforementioned issues are still to be examined by the trial Judge after completion of investigation.

15. At this stage, there doesn't appear to be any substantial material, which requires to be recovered from the possession of the petitioner, such as, weapon etc., because the allegations are not such. Petitioner is neither a registered nor an habitual criminal, which may cause any threat to the witnesses or may influence them in any manner. Furthermore, two minor children, who are aged about 04 years and 1½ years, respectively, would naturally require their mother's care in their daily lives.

Moreover, neither there is no material produced by the parties, nor is there any record available regarding any litigation initiated by the petitioner or her deceased husband before any Court of Law. Additionally, no complaint or similar document has been presented before this Court that could provide a tentative idea about the nature of the relationship between the petitioner and her deceased husband. Furthermore, it also remains unclear where the petitioner was staying at the time of the incident.

16. Considering the aforementioned parameters and the factors, which are yet to be gone into by the trial Court after having the evidence before it, and also by considering the judgments relied upon by counsel for the petitioner, as discussed and noticed here-above, I deem it proper to



extend the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, who is a woman and the mother of two minor children.

Thus, petitioner is directed to join the investigation on or before **21.03.2025**, and also, as and when required to do so by the Investigating Agency. In the event of her arrest, petitioner shall be released on ad-interim bail, subject to her furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer. Petitioner shall also be abide by all the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023.

Petitioner shall provide her complete contact details, viz., her full residential address, contact number(s), and email ID etc., to the Investigating Agency at the time of joining the investigation.

17. Besides, it is directed that petitioner would hand over her passport to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if she possesses. Otherwise, would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that she does not possess any passport.

It is also directed that before leaving country any time during trial, petitioner would seek prior permission of the Court.

18. Petition stands **disposed of** accordingly.

However, anything noticed here-above shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case(s).

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

**(SANJAY VASHISTH)**  
**JUDGE**

**March 05, 2025**

*J.Ram*

*Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No*  
*Whether Reportable: Yes/No*