

2025:PHHC:029056



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

229(2 cases) CRM M-56886 of 2024
Date of Decision: 27.02.2025

1.		
Kuldeep Kaur		...Petitioner
	Vs.	
State of Punjab		...Respondent
2.		
Ranjeet Singh		...Petitioner
	Vs.	
State of Punjab		...Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE N.S.SHEKHAWAT

Present : Mr. Rajat Dogra, Advocate
for the petitioner (in both the petitions).

Mr. Deepinder Singh Brar, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

N.S.SHEKHAWAT, J. (Oral)

1. This order shall dispose off above mentioned two petitions, i.e., CRM M-56886 of 2024 titled as “**Kuldeep Kaur Vs. State of Punjab**” and CRM M-2815 of 2025 titled as “**Ranjeet Singh Vs. State of Haryana**”, whereby, the petitioners have prayed for grant of regular bail to them in case FIR No. 31 dated 29.05.2024 under Sections 370, 34 and 120-B of IPC registered at Police Station Sadiq, District Faridkot.

2. The FIR in the present case was registered on the basis of the complaint moved by Sukhpreet Kaur wife of Gagandeep Singh and the same has been reproduced as under:-

“Complaints by Sukhpreet Kaur wife of Sh. Gagandeep Singh resident of village Pindi Balochan District Faridkot against Seema alias Preet wife of Ranjit Singh resident of village Sarupey Wala, Police Station Guruharsahai District Ferozepur were given to the senior officers and on receiving of said complaints, same were marked by the office of Senior Superintendent of Police, Faridkot vide No. 529/PC 9/24 dated 23.03.2024, 84PC dated 30.03.2024 and 131-PC 6/24 dated 07.05.2024 to Deputy Superintendent of Police (CAW&C), Faridkot, the contents of the complaint are that: To, the Senior Superintendent of Police, Faridkot. From: Sukhpreet Kaur wife of Sh.Gagandeep Singh resident of village Pindi Balochan, Faridkot against Seema @ Preet wife of Ranjit Singh resident of village Sarupeywala, District Ferozepur. Sir, it is requested that I Sukhpreet Kaur wife of Sh. Gagandeep Singh, am resident of village Pindi Balochan, Faridkot. On 18.05.2023, I gave birth to a female child and at the time of birth of child, I was seriously ill and I was not in my senses. My entire family started taking care of me. At that time my sister i.e. daughter of my Taya namely Seema @ Preet also came at village Pindi Balochan to know about my health condition and she told me she would hand over my daughter to Pardeep Kaur till my recovery from illness. Since I was ill, therefore I agreed for it. Seema

@ Preet took my daughter to take care of her and after getting well, when I told her to give my daughter, then she started making excuses. I requested her for many times and the respectables have also told her about it, but she flatly refused it and was saying that I had sold my daughter, I can do whatever I want to do. I and my family members are very upset. Therefore legal action be taken against Seema @ Preet and our daughter be returned to us from her. I have also given a complaint dated 01.03.2024 in this regard but no action has been taken in this regard against Seema alias Preet wife of Ranjit Singh son of Sh. Boga Singh resident of village Sarupey Wala District Ferozepur Mobile No. 99151-50977 Yours faithfully sd/- Sukhpreet Kaur. Sukhpreet Kaur wife of Sh. Gagandeep Singh resident of village Pindi Balochan, Faridkot Mobile No. 89689-65675, 94640-70975”.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of Kuldeep Kaur (petitioner in CRM M-56886 of 2024) contends that the allegations levelled in the FIR (Annexure P-1) are baseless and palpably false. In fact, Seema, co-accused, is the cousin of complainant. Seema and Sarabjit Kaur, real sister of the complainant are married in one village and Sarabjit Kaur had told Seema that a second girl child had been born in the family of her sister and she wanted to give her child in adoption to some genuine person, who wanted to adopt a minor girl. Seema talked to the petitioner and the petitioner had suggested the name of a lady, Naina, who actually wanted to adopt a girl child. On 19.12.2023, Naina and her husband and few other persons had gone to

the house of the complainant and the complainant and her husband had sworn certain affidavits and had handed over the child in adoption to Naina. Even, Sarabjit Kaur co-accused is the real sister of the complainant, whereas Seema co-accused, is the cousin of the complainant. Even, the petitioner is the sister-in-law of Seema, co-accused and even Naina is related to the petitioner. Learned counsel further contends that only allegation against the petitioner is that she has introduced Naina to Seema, co-accused for the adoption of the child and apart from that, no other role has been attributed to the petitioner. Learned counsel further contends that no other allegation has been levelled against the petitioner in the present case. The petitioner was arrested wrongly on 07th June 2024 and is in custody for the last about 08 months.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of Ranjeet Singh (petitioner in CRM M-2815 of 2025) has raised similar arguments and submitted that there was no specific allegation against the petitioner and he was named on the basis of the disclosure statement suffered by his co-accused. Even Ranjit Singh was arrested on 22.07.2024 and the trial is not likely to conclude.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the prayer made by the learned counsel for the petitioners on the ground that there are serious allegations against the petitioners and the petitioners are not entitled for the concession of regular bail.

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

7. In the present case, the complainant has alleged that her newly born girl child was taken away by the accused fraudulently. However, it is an admitted fact that the girl child has been reunited with the complainant/her mother. Kuldeep Kaur, petitioner is also related to the complainant in the present case and the prosecution is yet to lead evidence to bring the guilt of the petitioners. Petitioner Kuldeep Kaur was arrested on 07.06.2024 and petitioner Ranjeet Singh was arrested on 22.07.2024 and the trial is not even formally commenced. Thus, no purpose will be served by keeping the petitioners behind the bars.

8. In view of the above, without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petitions are allowed and the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail subject to their furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate, concerned.

27.02.2025
amit rana

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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