

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

293

CRM-M No.10051 of 2024
Date of Decision: 18.04.2024

SUNITAPetitioner

Vs
STATE OF PUNJABRespondent

CORAM: *HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARKESH MANUJA*

Present: Mr. Sylvester, Advocate for
Mr. Alok Mittal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Siddharth Sandhu, Asstt. A.G., Punjab with
Mr. Harsimrat Singh, DSP (Detective) SAS Nagar.

HARKESH MANUJA, J. (Oral)

1. By way of present petition filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C., prayer has been made for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.9 dated 10.01.2024 registered under Sections 420, 120-B IPC and Section 66 of the Information Technology Act, 2000 at Police Station Sohana, District SAS Nagar, Punjab.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner merely has been implicated on the basis of disclosure statement made by one of the co-accused namely Vijay Raj Kapooria, who happens to be her husband.
3. The prayer made on behalf of the petitioner has been opposed by learned State counsel while referring to the serious allegations of online fraud committed by the firm being run by husband of the petitioner wherein she was providing technical assistance.

4.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and gone through the paper book. I find substance in the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner.
5.

In the present case, the investigation has already been concluded with the filing of challan. Petitioner is not involved in any other case of similar nature and is behind the bars for almost 03 months. No material has been pointed at all by the Investigating Agency as well as learned State counsel so as to connect the petitioner with the alleged offence, who was implicated merely on the basis of disclosure statement made by co-accused Vijay Raj Kapooria i.e. her husband.
6.

Considering the fact that one the investigation has already stands concluded; there being no material to connect the petitioner with the alleged offence and the trial is likely to take sometime in its culmination, I do not find any justification to extend the incarceration of the petitioner.
7.

Accordingly, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to her furnishing adequate bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned Trial Court/Duty Magistrate.
8.

It is made clear that this order may not be construed as expression of an opinion on the merits of the case.

April 18, 2024
Atik

(HARKESH MANUJA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No