

**In The High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana
At Chandigarh**

CRM-M-60996-2022 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 19.1.2023

Kuljeet Kaur

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Sunil Chadha, Senior Advocate with
Ms. Tanu Dhull and Akshay Chadha, Advocates,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Luvinder Sofat, DAG, Punjab,
assisted by DSP Inderpal Singh.

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J.

1. The petitioner seeks grant of regular bail in respect of a case registered against her vide FIR No. 09, dated 28.7.2022, Police Station Vigilance Bureau, Economic Offences Wing, Ludhiana, Punjab, under Sections 7, 7-A, 8, 12, 13(2) of Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988, Sections 409, 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B IPC and Sections 65, 66, 66-C, 66-D of the Information and Technology Act, 2000.
2. The allegations, in nutshell, are that several irregularities had been committed in the matter of allotment of plots by Improvement Trust, Ludhiana, and the same were allotted in violation of the prescribed procedure, so as to extend undue benefit to several persons with

whom the officials of Improvement Trust, Ludhiana, were conniving. It is further the case of prosecution that the officials of Improvement Trust, in connivance with some of the allottees had been preparing incorrect reports so as to facilitate the waiver of Non-Construction Fee (NCF) which the allottees were supposed to deposit for not raising construction upon the allotted plots within the prescribed period. The petitioner had remained posted as Executive Officer of the Improvement Trust, Ludhiana, during the period in question.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case and that she had recommended the allotment or waiver of NCF on the basis of the reports and notings put up before her and that there is nothing on record to show that the petitioner had accepted any illegal gratification so as to extend any kind of benefit to the allottees. It has also been submitted that several other co-accused have already been granted bail by this Court.
4. Opposing the petition, the learned State counsel has submitted that the petitioner having been posted as Executive Officer was the key person in the matters of allotment of plots and waiver of Non-Construction Fee and that she cannot plead innocence when everything was being done right under her nose and under her signatures. The learned State counsel has however, informed that the petitioner as on date has been behind bars since the last about 5 months and 20 days and that challan already stands presented and that the petitioner otherwise is not involved in any other case.

5. This Court has considered the rival submissions.
6. Without expressing anything as regards the merits of the case, but while noticing that several other co-accused of the petitioner have already been released on bail and the petitioner has been behind bars for a substantial period of more than 5 months and that challan already stands presented, her further detention would not serve any useful purpose, particularly when the trial is not even stated to have commenced. The petitioner being a lady and having a clean record otherwise also deserves concession in the matter of grant of bail. The petition, as such, is accepted and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to her furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned.

19.1.2023
mohan

(GURVINDER SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking /reasoned	Yes / No
Whether Reportable	Yes / No