



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

223

CRM-M-37352-2025
Decided on : 25.09.2025

Shivani Sachdeva and another . . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Deepinder Singh Virk, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Manjinder S. Bhullar, DAG, Punjab.

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
Shivani Sachdeva and Amit Juneja	89	29.05.2025	420, 120-B of IPC, 1860 and 24 of the Immigration Act	Model Town	District Police Commissioner, Ludhiana

2. On 17.07.2025, Coordinate Bench of this Court, passed the following order:-

“ Petitioners are seeking the concession of anticipatory bail in FIR No.89 dated 29.05.2025 under Sections 420, 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, and Section 24 of The Emigration Act, registered at Police Station Model Town, Ludhiana.

Learned counsel for the petitioners, inter alia, submits that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in the present case on the allegations that they defrauded the complainant on the pretext of arranging a VISA for his daughter. It is, however, contended that no such assurance or guarantee regarding the grant of VISA was ever extended by the petitioners. Rather, the petitioners merely provided consultancy services, which included facilitating admission for the daughter of the complainant to the Community College of Philadelphia, USA.

In support of this contention, learned counsel has drawn the attention of this Court to a duly signed consent and acknowledgement form annexed as Annexure P-3, which reflects that the complainant and his daughter had voluntarily availed services from M/s. Akcxis International Services. It is pointed



out that the said undertaking, dated 29.04.2024 categorically records that in the event of rejection or refusal of VISA, the said consultancy firm would not bear no responsibility. Thus, it is submitted that despite the explicit disclaimer regarding VISA approval, which is solely within the discretion of the concerned embassy, the complainant has maliciously implicated the petitioner, solely on account of the subsequent rejection of her VISA by the US embassy.

Learned counsel further submits that the allegation regarding an outstanding liability of ₹4,81,000/- is patently false and misleading. It is submitted that the petitioners had, in fact, paid all dues that were legitimately owed to the complainant, which amounted to ₹55,000/- and the same was duly acknowledged by the complainant himself through a "No Dues Certificate". In support, attention of this Court has been drawn to Annexure P-9.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. H.S. Deol, Senior Deputy Advocate General, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent.

Adjourned to 25.09.2025.

Meanwhile, the petitioners are directed to join the investigation and appear before the investigating agency as and when called upon to do so. In the event of their arrest, they shall be admitted to interim bail on their furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting/Investigating Officer. The petitioners shall abide by the terms and conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) BNSS/438(2) Cr.P.C."

3. Continuing his submissions, learned counsel for the petitioners contends that in compliance of the order dated 17.07.2025, passed by this Court, petitioners have 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, confirms the said averment made by learned counsel for the petitioners of joining the investigation on 19.09.2025, by the petitioners, and submits that as of now, custodial interrogation of the petitioners is not required for the purpose of investigation.

5. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

6. Since, petitioners have already joined the investigation and custodial interrogation is no more required; ad-interim bail order dated 17.07.2025, passed by this Court is hereby made absolute. Accordingly, present petition is allowed.

However, petitioners 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.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

September 25, 2025

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No