



241

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

**CRM-M No.4421 of 2025
Date of decision : 20.08.2025**

Ravneet Kaur**.....Petitioner****versus****State of Punjab****..... Respondent****CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ**

Present :- Mr. Siddharth Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Simran Gorla, Asstt. A.G., Punjab.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed praying for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.09, dated 04.01.2024, under Sections 420, 120-B of IPC, 1860 and Section 24 of Immigration Act, 1983, registered at Police Station Zirakpur, District SAS Nagar.

2. Succinctly the facts of the case are that FIR in the present case was got registered on the statement of complainant, namely, Kuldeep Singh. It was alleged that his nephew, namely, Jaspreet Singh and his wife, namely, Pooja wanted to go to Australia and hence, his niece, namely, Amanpreet Kaur informed him that her friends namely, Ravneet Kaur (petitioner) and Navneet Kaur can help them in sending abroad. His niece, Amanpreet Kaur, made him to meet her friend, namely, Ravneet



Kaur (petitioner). It was alleged that she informed that the total expenses to be incurred would be Rs.30 Lacs for sending them to Australia. It was alleged that the complainant paid Rs.3,00,000/- to Ravneet Kaur and Rs.2,00,000/- to Navneet Kaur. Another amount was also paid to them and they were promised to be issued with the visa for Australia. However they were provided the visa for Vietnam on the assurance that after going to Vietnam, they would be sent to Australia. Both his nephew and his wife went to Vietnam and after remaining there for a month, they were sent to Bangkok, where they remained for a month and then, they finally returned to India. They found that the visa given to them was forged. It was alleged that they have been cheated for an amount of Rs.30 Lacs and thus, the request was made to take legal action against the accused. On registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. The petitioner was arrested on 06.06.2024. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, SAS Nagar praying for the grant of bail, however after hearing both the sides and finding no merit in the same, the learned Additional Sessions Judge, SAS Nagar declined the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 11.11.2024. Hence being aggrieved, the petitioner is again before this Court by way of filing the present second petition praying for the grant of regular bail.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has vehemently contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He has submitted that from the bare reading of the allegations made in the FIR, it is apparent that the main accused in the present case was Amanpreet Kaur, who is none other than the niece of complainant himself. However during



the investigation, she has been kept in Col. No.2. He has submitted that Navneet Kaur has been granted anticipatory bail by the Hon'ble Supreme Court. He has submitted that the amount of Rs.3,00,000/- has been allegedly given to the petitioner after the nephew of the complainant and his wife returned to India. He has submitted that when both of them had came to know about the visa being forged in Vietnam itself, then there was no occasion for them to pay any amount to the petitioner. He has submitted that the petitioner is behind bars since the date of her arrest, i.e. 06.06.2024, but till date, even the charges are not framed and thus, the right of speedy trial has been defeated.. He has submitted that though the petitioner is falsely involved in one more case, however she is on bail in that case. He has submitted that in the facts and circumstances, the petitioner deserves to be granted bail.

4. Reply dated 20.08.2025 by way of an affidavit of Gurcharan Singh Dhaliwal, PPS, Superintendent Central Jail, Patiala on behalf of the respondent-State has been filed by learned State counsel today in the Court and the same is taken on record. Copy thereof has been supplied to learned counsel for the petitioner.

5. *Per contra*, learned counsel for the State however has vehemently opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. She has submitted that there are specific allegations against the petitioner. She has submitted that the petitioner has played an active role in cheating the complainant to the tune of Rs.35 Lacs. She has submitted that there is a transaction of Rs.3,00,000/- in the account of the petitioner as well substantiating her complicity in the present case. She, on instructions, has



submitted that out of total 10 prosecution witnesses, no witness has been examined. She has placed on record custody certificate of the petitioner today in the Court and the same is taken on record.

6. Heard.

7. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner has been arrested on 06.06.2024 and since then she is behind bars. The co-accused, namely, Navneet Kaur in the present case has already been granted anticipatory bail by the Hon'ble Supreme Court and thereafter, during the investigation, she has been kept in Col. No.2. Custody certificate produced would show that the petitioner has completed incarceration of 01 year, 02 months and 10 days as on 19.08.2025. Custody Certificate further shows that the petitioner is involved in one more case, however she is on bail in that case. Out of 10 prosecution witnesses, no witness has been examined till date. There is no gainsaying that every accused has a right of speedy trial.

8. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Ashim @ Asim Kumar Haranath Bhattacharya @ Asim Harinath Bhattacharya @ Aseem Kumar Bhattacharya Vs. National Investigation Agency, 2022(1) SCC 695* has held as under:

“Deprivation of personal liberty without ensuring speedy trial is not consistent with Article 21 of the Constitution of India. While deprivation of personal liberty for some period may not be avoidable, period of deprivation pending trial/appeal cannot be unduly long. At the same time, timely delivery of justice is part of human rights and denial of speedy justice is a threat to public confidence in the administration of justice.”

9. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after

the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court.

10. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, the Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for the grant of bail. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on her furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

20.08.2025
rittu

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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