



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

242

CRM-M-51171-2024

Date of decision: 10.12.2024

Charanjeet Kaur Cheema @ Charanjeet Kaur SandhuPetitioner

Versus

State of PunjabRespondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAULPresent : Mr. Bhanu Pratap Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Amit Rana, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of bail under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in case FIR No.16 dated 02.08.2024 under Sections 409, 420, 465, 467, 471, 201, 120-B of the IPC and Sections 13(1)A, 13(2) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 as amended by Amendment Act, 1988, registered at Police Station Vigilance Bureau Range, Jalandhar.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner, who has been in custody since 04.08.2024 for allegedly conniving with the co-accused and handing over certain documents of some students who had taken admission in a Nursing School, which had thereafter not been brought on record of Punjab Nursing Registration Council, Mohali (PNRC). It has been submitted that in addition, false allegations have been levelled that the petitioner along with the co-accused had also taken and accepted bribe. Learned counsel



CRM-M-51171-2024

submits that the petitioner is a 66 year old retired lady; investigation qua her is completed and since the entire case of the prosecution hinges on documentary evidence, there can now be no apprehension of the petitioner tampering with evidence or influencing/intimidating the witnesses. A prayer has, therefore, been made to enlarge the petitioner on bail.

3. Per contra, learned State counsel while opposing the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner, on instructions, has not disputed the custody period of the petitioner nor has he, on instructions, disputed that the investigation qua the petitioner is complete and challan also stands presented.

4. On a pointed query learned State counsel, on instructions, has submitted that the petitioner was serving as Registrar of the PNRC. On further query, learned State counsel submits that as many as 33 witnesses have been cited by the prosecution, who are yet to be examined in view of the fact that charges are likely to be framed only on the next date of hearing i.e. 21.12.2024.

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

6. The case of the prosecution hinges on documentary evidence, which as not disputed by the learned State counsel, is already part of the challan, which stands presented before the learned Trial Court. The petitioner has been in custody since 04.08.2024 and the trial, in the aforementioned facts and circumstances, would take considerable time to conclude. Hence, this Court deems it fit to extend

**CRM-M-51171-2024**

the concession of bail to the petitioner, who is a 66 year old lady.

7. Accordingly, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner be admitted to bail on her furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned. 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.

8. Needless to add, in case the petitioner misuses the concession of bail granted to her, the State would be at liberty to seek cancellation of the same.

10.12.2024

Vinay

**(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE**

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