



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

210

**CRM-M-22142-2025 (O&M)**

**Date of decision: 23.05.2025**

Suman Puri

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA**

Present: Mr. Amandeep Saini, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Sheenu Sura, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Sunil Kumar Goswami, Advocate for the complainant.

\*\*\*

**MANISHA BATRA, J (ORAL):-**

The instant petition is the 4<sup>th</sup> petition filed by the petitioner seeking grant of pre-arrest bail in case bearing FIR No. 118 dated 07.05.2024 registered under Sections 406, 420, 506 of IPC at Police Station Safidon, District Jind.

2. The petitioner has been booked for commission of offences of cheating, criminal breach of trust and criminal intimidation on the allegations that she along with the co-accused was involved in the business of sending people abroad and had induced the complainant-Randhir Singh to part with a sum of Rs.21,86,000/- on the pretext of sending his son abroad. She had prepared false Visa for Australia and with a dishonest intention to dupe the complainant of his hard earned money. Investigation proceedings are still underway. She had previously moved applications seeking pre-arrest



bail which have been dismissed by this Court. It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that a compromise has now been arrived at between the complainant herself and the co-accused and in pursuance thereof, the parties have agreed to settle the matter for a sum of Rs.7,00,000/-. She is ready to join the investigation. Her custodial interrogation is not required. With these broad submissions, it is urged that she deserves extended benefit of bail.

3. Status report has been filed by respondent-State. It is argued by learned DAG, Haryana that the previous bail application of the petitioner had been dismissed by passing a detailed order. No new ground has been made out for allowing its application and therefore, it is pressed that the petition does not deserves to be allowed.

4. Learned counsel for the complainant on the other hand has placed on record a copy of compromise deed dated 22.05.2025 and has affirmed the fact that a compromise has been arrived at between the parties. He has also submitted that he has received a demand draft for a sum of Rs.3,50,000/- in the name of the complainant in compliance of the terms of the compromise and it is also submitted that the respondent-complainant has no objection if the petition is allowed.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length and have gone through the record carefully.

6. Given the nature of the allegations, coupled with the fact that the petitioner is going to file a petition seeking quashing of the FIR on the basis of compromise and has also given demand draft of a sum of Rs.3,50,000/-, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petition



deserves to be allowed. The same is accordingly allowed. The petitioner is directed to surrender before the arresting Officer/Investing Officer within a period of 2 weeks from today to join investigation. On his joining investigation and in the event of his arrest, he shall be admitted to bail subject to his furnishing personal as well as surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Investigating Officer/Arresting Officer. He shall make payment of remaining amount of Rs.3,50,000/- as per the terms of the compromise deed and further subject to compliance of usual terms and conditions as enumerated in Section 482 (2) of the BNSS.

7. Since the main petition has been allowed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

**[MANISHA BATRA]**  
**JUDGE**

**23.05.2025**

*poonam*

1. *Whether speaking/ reasoned* : *Yes / No*  
2. *Whether reportable* : *Yes / No*