



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

CRM-M-38492-2025

Date of Decision:25.07.2025

TEENU CHAUHAN

...Petitioner

Vs.

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. Kuldeep Singh Saini, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Rajiv Verma, Senior DAG, Punjab.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J. (Oral)

1. Relief sought

The jurisdiction of this Court has been invoked under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No. 30 dated 03.04.2025 under Sections 318 (4) 316 (2) of BNS (420/406 of IPC), registered at Police Station Kiratpur Sahib, District Ropar. Annexure P-1.

2. Contentions

On behalf of the petitioner

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. She has neither cheated the complainant nor dishonestly induced him to deliver any amount on the pretext of getting the job for the son and nephews of complainant in Railway Department. He further submits that there is no mention has been made in the FIR of money having given to petitioner by the complainant Prem Singh. It is further submitted that complainant Prem Singh is a building contractor and petitioner has taken loan of Rs. 10,00,000/- which was disbursed in



stages. Learned counsel for petitioner has further submitted that she borrowed Rs.50,000/- for purchasing the cement from complainant Prem Singh, entry of which has been wrongly shown suggesting that complainant paid amount to Saurav Chauhan. Petitioner is in custody since 04.05.2025 even though nothing was recovered from her possession. Therefore, the petitioner may kindly be released on regular bail.

On behalf of the State

On the other hand, learned State counsel has produced the custody certificate of the petitioner today in Court, which is taken on record. He seeks dismissal of the instant petition on the ground that the petitioner in connivance with her husband Saurav Chauhan cheated the complainant and thereby dishonestly induced him to deliver 3,30,000/- on pretext of job to the son and two nephews of complainant in Railway Department. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor has further submitted that the payment of Rs.50,000/- has been disbursed in her account on 18.08.2023. He has further submitted that Saurav Chauhan had executed an agreement dated 08.08.2024 mentioning that he has taken Rs. 7,50,000/- from Avtar Singh for job in Railway Department but he could not get the work done and agreed to return the amount of Rs.7,50,000/- to Avtar Singh on or before 01.09.2024.

3. **Analysis**

Be that as it may, considering the custody period i.e. 02 months and 19 days for which the petitioner has suffered incarceration; petitioner is a mother of two minor children aged 02 years and 07 years in addition to the



fact that investigation is complete, challan stands presented to Court on 02.07.2025, charges are yet to be framed and total 39 prosecution witnesses have been cited and none has been examined so far, which is suffice for this Court to infer that the conclusion of trial will take a long time for which the petitioner cannot be detained behind the bars for an indefinite period.

Reliance can be placed upon the judgment of the Apex Court rendered in “***Dataram versus State of Uttar Pradesh and another***”, 2018(2) ***R.C.R. (Criminal) 131***, wherein it has been held that the grant of bail is a general rule and putting persons in jail or in prison or in correction home is an exception. Relevant paras of the said judgment is reproduced as under:-

“2. A fundamental postulate of criminal jurisprudence is the presumption of innocence, meaning thereby that a person is believed to be innocent until found guilty. However, there are instances in our criminal law where a reverse onus has been placed on an accused with regard to some specific offences but that is another matter and does not detract from the fundamental postulate in respect of other offences. Yet another important facet of our criminal jurisprudence is that the grant of bail is the general rule and putting a person in jail or in a prison or in a correction home (whichever expression one may wish to use) is an exception. Unfortunately, some of these basic principles appear to have been lost sight of with the result that more and more persons are being incarcerated and for longer periods. This does not do any good to our criminal jurisprudence or to our society.

3. There is no doubt that the grant or denial of bail is entirely the discretion of the judge considering a case but even so, the exercise of judicial discretion has been circumscribed by a large number of decisions rendered by this Court and by every High Court in the country. Yet, occasionally there is a necessity to introspect whether denying bail to an accused person is the right thing to do on the facts and in the circumstances of a case.

4. While so introspecting, among the factors that need to be



considered is whether the accused was arrested during investigations when that person perhaps has the best opportunity to tamper with the evidence or influence witnesses. If the investigating officer does not find it necessary to arrest an accused person during investigations, a strong case should be made out for placing that person in judicial custody after a charge sheet is filed. Similarly, it is important to ascertain whether the accused was participating in the investigations to the satisfaction of the investigating officer and was not absconding or not appearing when required by the investigating officer. Surely, if an accused is not hiding from the investigating officer or is hiding due to some genuine and expressed fear of being victimised, it would be a factor that a judge would need to consider in an appropriate case. It is also necessary for the judge to consider whether the accused is a first-time offender or has been accused of other offences and if so, the nature of such offences and his or her general conduct. The poverty or the deemed indigent status of an accused is also an extremely important factor and even Parliament has taken notice of it by incorporating an Explanation to section 436 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973. An equally soft approach to incarceration has been taken by Parliament by inserting section 436A in the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973.

*5. To put it shortly, a humane attitude is required to be adopted by a judge, while dealing with an application for remanding a suspect or an accused person to police custody or judicial custody. There are several reasons for this including maintaining the dignity of an accused person, howsoever poor that person might be, the requirements of Article 21 of the Constitution and the fact that there is enormous overcrowding in prisons, leading to social and other problems as noticed by this Court in *In Re-Inhuman Conditions in 1382 Prisons*, 2017(4) RCR (Criminal) 416: 2017(5) Recent Apex Judgments (R.A.J.) 408 : (2017) 10 SCC 658*

*6. The historical background of the provision for bail has been elaborately and lucidly explained in a recent decision delivered in *Nikesh Tara chand Shah v. Union of India*, 2017 (13) SCALE 609 going back to the days of the Magna Carta. In that decision, reference was made to *Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia v. State of Punjab*, (1980) 2 SCC 565 in which it is observed that it was held way back*



in Nagendra v. King-Emperor, AIR 1924 Calcutta 476 that bail is not to be withheld as a punishment. Reference was also made to Emperor v. Hutchinson, AIR 1931 Allahabad 356 wherein it was observed that grant of bail is the rule and refusal is the exception. The provision for bail is therefore age-old and the liberal interpretation to the provision for bail is almost a century old, going back to colonial days.

7. However, we should not be understood to mean that bail should be granted in every case. The grant or refusal of bail is entirely within the discretion of the judge hearing the matter and though that discretion is unfettered, it must be exercised judiciously and in a humane manner and compassionately. Also, conditions for the grant of bail ought not to be so strict as to be incapable of compliance, thereby making the grant of bail illusory.”

5. **DECISION:**

In view of the discussions made hereinabove, the petitioner is hereby directed to be released on regular bail on her furnishing bail and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

In the afore-said terms, the present petition is hereby allowed.

However, it is made clear that anything stated hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

25.07.2025

kv

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	:	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	:	<i>Yes/No</i>