



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

277

CRM-M No.19164 of 2025 (O&M)

Date of decision : 14.05.2025

Ms. Neeru Narang

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.. Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S. GREWAL

Present:- Mr. Chandan Deep Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Parveen Kumar Aggarwal, DAG, Haryana.

H.S. Grewal, J. (Oral)

This is a petition for regular bail filed under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS) in case bearing FIR No.40 dated 28.01.2024 under Sections 406, 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B IPC registered at Police Station Hodal, District Palwal.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner alongwith her co-accused had allured the complainant and had grabbed an amount of Rs.28.83 lakhs on the pretext of giving him a job in the Education Department.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that she has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further contends that the main accused is Virender Chaudhary and one person namely Mishra and the petitioner being a lady, has been misused by the co-accused and got deposited the amount received from them in her bank account. He further states that the petitioner has been in custody since 03.09.2024. It is further stated that out of 22 cited prosecution witnesses, only 2 have been examined.

4. Learned counsel for the State vehemently opposes the grant of concession of regular bail by way of filing custody certificate dated 13.05.2025.



He, on instructions from ASI-Mohd. Yashir Khan, states that the petitioner has been in custody for a period of 08 months and 11 days, however, does not refute the fact that out of 22 total prosecution witnesses, only 02 have been examined so far.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the material placed on record.

7. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, and the fact that the petitioner is in custody for a period of 08 months and 11 days and only 2 out of 22 prosecution witnesses have yet been examined, the conclusion of the trial is likely to take a long time and continuous detention of the petitioner pending trial, would not serve the ends of justice. In the present case, I deem it a fit case to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

8. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is granted concession of regular bail in the present case, on her furnishing requisite bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/ Duty Magistrate/ Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned. The pending application(s), if any, is also disposed of.

9. It is however, made clear that in case during his bail, the petitioner indulges in any offence, the State shall be at liberty to file an application for cancellation of bail of the petitioner.

14th May, 2025

Sonia Puri

(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE

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