

IN THE COURT OF SHRI GAGANDEEP SINGH GARG,
ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE,
BATHINDA
(UID No.PB00295)

BA 1439 of 2026

Application under Section 482 BNSS for Anticipatory Bail

FIR No.09 dated 7.1.2026,
under Section 318(4), 61(2) of
The Bhartia Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), 2023,
Police Station Raman, District Bathinda.

Veena Rani, aged about 56 years, wife of Late Ravinder Kumar,
resident of Raman Mandi, Police Station Raman, District Bathinda.
.....Petitioner.

Versus

State of PunjabRespondent.

Present: Ms.Poonam Rani, Advocate, counsel for petitioner

Ms.Amandeep Kaur, Additional Public Prosecutor for the
State.

ORDER

1. Petitioner-accused apprehending her arrest in abovesaid FIR has filed the instant application under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 for the grant of anticipatory bail.
2. It is pleaded that it is the first bail application filed on behalf of the petitioner. The application is supported with affidavit of petitioner in this regard. It is pleaded that the present case has been registered on the basis of application filed by Nanak Ram son of Bhana Ram. The facts of

FIR are reiterated in the present bail application. It is pleaded that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is pleaded that the complainant has no right, title or concern with the property in question. It is pleaded that the property in question had fallen to the share of Ravinder Kumar, husband of the petitioner. After the death of Ravinder Kumar, the property in dispute has been inherited by the petitioner alongwith her children. The same was rightly got transferred by them in their names. The same has been rightly sold by them. It is pleaded that no free and fair inquiry has been conducted by the police. It is pleaded that nothing is to be recovered from the petitioner. It is pleaded that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required. The petitioner undertakes to abide by the terms of the bail if granted. Hence the application.

3. The report of the Ahlmad is on record as per which it is the first bail application under Section 482 BNSS moved on behalf of petitioner-accused in the present FIR and no other bail application is decided or pending in this Court or in any Hon'ble Superior Court.

4. The FIR has been got registered on the complaint of Nanak Ram against Veena Rani, Poonam Rani and juvenile. It is alleged that Veena Rani, Poonam Rani and the minor showed themselves to be the sole legal heir of Bhana Ram. They in connivance with the official of the Municipal Committee got the house bearing MC No.11/19 transferred on their name. Thereafter they sold the house vide sale deed dated 7.5.2025.

A false pedigree table was prepared in connivance with Shivji Ram stamp vendor. Nanak Ram is the son of Bhana Ram. It is claimed that the house in question was owned by Bhana Ram and the same is the ancestral property of the parties. Yamna Devi, Lali Devi and Radha are the daughters of Bhana Ram. Ravinder Kumar husband of Veena Rani has died. The other legal heirs of Bhana Ram did not give any consent for transfer of the house solely in favour of the accused. It was claimed by the accused that Bhana Ram during his life time had partitioned his estate. The accused sold the land falling to their share. It is claimed that the alleged pedigree table pertained only to the legal heir of deceased Ravinder Kumar. During inquiry it transpired that the Bhana Ram was the owner of the house in question who had died in the year 1994. The accused filed an application to incorporate their name as the LR of the deceased. It is alleged that the accused in this manner cheated the complainant by falsely claiming themselves to be sole legal heirs of Bhana Ram. They prepared a false pedigree table and in this manner caused loss to the other legal heirs of Bhana Ram. Accordingly the FIR has been registered.

5. The notice of the bail application has been served upon the Ld. APP for the State. The police record is produced and perused. Statement of SI Chet Singh, No.629/Bathinda, Police Station Raman, has been recorded. It is stated by him that the present FIR has been registered against two accused namely Veena Rani, Poonam Rani and

against the juvenile. The applicant is yet to be taken into custody. No other offence has been added in present FIR. No other accused has been nominated. No other FIR has been registered against the applicant-accused.

6. I have heard learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State and learned counsel for the petitioner-accused. I have gone through the record of the case.

7. It is argued by the leaned counsel for the petitioner that the property devolved in the hands of the accused and the juvenile in a family partition. Thereafter they treating themselves to be the exclusive owner of the house further transferred the same. It is argued that no recovery is to be effected from the petitioner. The allegations are subject to proof during trial. The custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required. Therefore, it is prayed that the petitioner be granted concession of pre-arrest bail.

8. On the other hand it is argued by the learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State that the petitioner is involved in a serious offence and therefore, there is no ground to grant the concession of bail.

9. The guiding parameters as laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court for disposal of the application for pre-arrest bail are outlined in case law cited as **Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia v. State of Punjab, (SC) 1980 AIR(SC) 1632, Bhadresh Bipinbhai Sheth v. State of Gujarat and Another 2015 AIR(SC) 3090 and Sushila Aggarwal**

and others - Petitioners Versus State (NCT of Delhi) and another – Respondents 2020 AIR (SC) 831.

10. In the present case, it is the allegation that the accused cheated the complainant party as they managed to get the property transferred on their name and thereafter sell the same. The allegations are documentary in nature. The authenticity of allegations against the petitioner can only be adjudged during the course of trial. In these circumstances, there is no legal impediment in extending the benefit of interim bail to the applicant (accused).

11. Accordingly, on the basis of the findings given above the petitioner-accused is granted the concession of interim bail. The petitioner-accused shall appear before the investigating officer and join the investigation within a period of 10 days from today and cooperate with the investigating agency. In the event of the petitioner-accused joining the investigation, the petitioner shall be released on bail to the satisfaction of the arresting officer/IO/SHO concerned police station. Further, following conditions are imposed upon the accused :

- a) That accused shall not commit an offence similar to the offence of which he is accused, or suspected, of the commission of which he is suspected;
- b) That accused shall not directly or indirectly make an 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 or tamper with the evidence; and

c) That accused shall not leave the country without prior permission of Court.

12. The application be put up on 18.4.2026 for awaiting report of the IO. A copy of this order be forwarded to the SHO for compliance. The observation made in the order shall have no reflection on the merits of the case.

Date of Order:4.4.2026
(Suman Bala, Stenographer)

(Gagandeep Singh Garg),
Additional Sessions Judge,
Bathinda /4.4.2026
(UID-PB0295)

(Gagandeep Singh Garg),
Additional Sessions Judge, Bathinda. (UID-PB0295)