



CRM-M-44810-2024

-1-

**237 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CRM-M-44810-2024
Decided on : 04.11.2024

Baljinder Kaur Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present : Mr. Rohan Mittal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Amit Rana, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

Manjari Nehru Kaul, J.(Oral)

Mr. Raj Karan Singh Verka, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of the complainant and filed memo of appearance in Court today, which is taken on record.

Main case

1. This is the petition filed by the petitioner seeking concession of regular bail in case FIR No.7 dated 13.01.2024 under Sections 420, 120-B IPC and Section 13 of Punjab Travel Professionals Regulation Act, 2014 registered at Police Station Kamboj District Amritsar.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in a Magisterial trial the petitioner has now been in custody since 07.03.2024; investigation is complete as challan stands presented,



however, charges have not yet been framed coupled with the fact that as many as 19 witnesses have been cited by the prosecution. Hence, the possibility of the trial concluding in the near future is unlikely. Learned counsel further submits that the prime accused in the FIR in question is the husband of the petitioner, who had allegedly lured the complainant to part with money on the pretext of sending his son to United States of America; thereafter the son of the complainant had allegedly been stranded in Azarbaijan and for bringing him back to India, the petitioner along with the other co-accused i.e. her husband and others demanded a sum of Rs.5 lacs. Learned counsel has still further submitted that it is evidently a case of false implication and the allegations levelled against the petitioner are completely vague; she has been implicated only because she happens to be the wife of the prime accused.

3. Per contra, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the prayer and submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner by drawing the attention of this Court to the allegations levelled in the FIR in question.

4. On a pointed query put to the learned State counsel, he along with counsel for the complainant have not disputed that as per allegations, the complainant was lured not by the petitioner but by her husband i.e. co-accused, who is already in custody. However, it has been asserted that when the son of the complainant was left stranded



CRM-M-44810-2024

-3-

in Azarbaijan, the petitioner along with the co-accused demanded a sum of Rs.5 lacs for getting the son of the complainant back to India.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material placed on record.

6. The petitioner has been in custody since 07.03.2024 in a Magisterial trial. The investigation in the case in hand is complete as challan stands presented. The trial has not progressed further as charges are yet to be framed.

7. In the facts and circumstances as enumerated hereinabove, this Court deems it fit to extend the concession of regular bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner be admitted to bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

8. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

04.11.2024
sonia

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

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