



248

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

CRM-M-22134-2025

Date of Decision:01.05.2025

KUSHAL DEEP KAUR ALIAS TARANDEEP KAUR

...PETITIONER

VS.

STATE OF HARYANA

...RESPONDENT

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat

Present : Mr. Mukesh Yadav, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rupinder Singh Jhand, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 with a prayer to grant regular bail to her in case FIR No.430 dated 16.07.2024, registered under Sections 420, 120-B of IPC (Sections 467 & 468 IPC added later on), Police Station Samalkha, District Panipat.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner had no connection with the allegations levelled in the present case and has been falsely involved alongwith the other accused. In fact the petitioner was a mere employee in the firm, which was owned by Vikas Sharma and she was getting monthly salary of Rs.30,000/- per month. He further refers to Annexures P-3




and P-4 to contend that Vikas Sharma was the sole proprietor of the firm M/s Immigration Solution. Even Rs.9,29,100/- were also deposited by the complainant in the account of the firm M/s Immigration Solution and the petitioner can never be tentatively beneficiary of any such transaction. He further contends that even from the account statement of the petitioner (Annexure P-6), its stand established that the petitioner was just getting monthly salary from the firm. The petitioner was arrested in the present case on 07.12.2024 and challan has already been presented against her. He further contends that even though, 06 more cases were ordered to be registered against the petitioner but she is on bail in these cases.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that serious allegations have been levelled against the present petitioner and she does not deserve the concession of bail by this Court.

4. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record carefully.

5. In the present case, admittedly the amount of Rs.9,29,100/- was deposited in the account of the firm M/s Immigration Solution and the petitioner has been able to show that she was working as an employee in the firm M/s Immigration Solution. Still further the petitioner is in custody for the last about 05 months and the trial is yet to formally start against her. Thus, further custody of the petitioner will not serve any useful purpose.

6. Without commenting 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 bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate, concerned.

01.05.2025
vipin

(N.S. SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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