



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

Sr. No.201

CRM-M-36549-2024
Date of Decision: 23.01.2025

Sunita
State of Punjab

Versus

.... Petitioner
... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA

Present: Mr. Saurabh Arora, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. Satjot Singh Chahal, AAG, Punjab.

TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA, J. (ORAL)

The petition has been filed seeking grant of regular bail in case FIR No.13 dated 02.11.2020, registered under Sections 7, 7-A of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988, Sections 409, 420, 465, 466, 467, 471 and 120-B of IPC, 1860, at Police Station Vigilance Bureau, Flying Squad-I, Punjab at Mohali.

2. As per allegations against the petitioner, a land measuring 80 *kanal* was mutated in her name in connivance with the co-accused/revenue officials who wrongly entered more shares than the actual shares of the *khewatdars* in the record, and shares of some of the *khewatdars* were reduced. And many persons who had no share in the land were wrongly allotted the shares.

3. Learned counsel contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the case during investigation. Although she has been named in the FIR, no credible material could be produced against her during the investigation. All other nineteen co-accused with similar allegations have already been released on bail. The petitioner was taken in custody on



20.05.2024, and was released on interim bail by this Court on 03.10.2024.

The trial of the case is not progressing.

4. Learned State counsel, on instructions from Inspector Harish Kumar, Vigilance Bureau, Flying Squad-I, does not dispute that all the co-accused with similar allegations have already been enlarged on bail. There are 111 prosecution witnesses, and none of them has been examined so far; the trial is fixed for framing of charges on 29.01.2025.

5. Heard.

6. Considering the totality of facts aforementioned, it is apparent that trial of the case will take some time to conclude, as none of the prosecution witnesses has been examined so far. The petitioner is already on interim bail since 03.10.2024, and no apprehension has been expressed that she has tried to influence the witnesses or tamper with the evidence in any manner. Therefore, no useful purpose will be served by taking her in custody again.

7. Accordingly, petition is allowed, and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail. However, the interim bail bonds furnished in pursuance of the order, dated 03.10.2024, shall be treated as regular bail bonds.

(TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA)
JUDGE

23.01.2025
Maninder

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