

2026:PHHC:082898



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.24766 of 2026

Pardeep Kaur @ Baby ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ... Respondent

1.	The date when the judgment is reserved	25.05.2026
2.	The date when the judgment is pronounced	26.05.2026
3.	The date when the judgment is uploaded on the website	26.05.2026
4.	Whether only operative part of the judgment is pronounced or whether the full judgment is pronounced	Full
5.	The delay, if any, of the pronouncement of full judgment, and reasons thereof	Not applicable

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Fatehjeet Singh, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Sakshi Bakshi, AAG, Punjab,
for the respondent-State.

MANISHA BATRA, J.

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under
Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (For short

2026:PHHC:082898



“BNSS”) seeking regular bail in the FIR mentioned below:-

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
95	23.08.2021	Navi Baradari, District Police Commissionerate Jalandhar	420 and 120-B of IPC and 13 of Punjab Travel Professionals Regulation Act, 2014 (201 of IPC was added later on)

2. Brief facts relevant for the purpose of disposal of this petition are that the aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of a written complaint submitted by the complainant Kewal Krishan alleging therein that the accused Sukhpreet Singh @ Sunny, his wife Pooja and the present petitioner had induced his daughter Komal by alluring her to provide a job in a beauty parlour at Muscat on a good salary. On being allured by them, her daughter had left for Muscat on 25.05.2019. On reaching there, instead of providing job in a parlour, she was sold to work in a Sheikh’s house. On coming to know about this fact from his daughter on phone, he had contacted the accused Sukhpreet Singh @ Sunny and Pooja but they did not listen to him. He had moved applications before the police but no action had been taken. He also alleged that an amount of Rs.55,000/- had been given by him to the accused for the purpose of bringing her daughter from Muscat to India but still his daughter had not been brought back to India. He prayed for taking action against the culprits.

3. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. The petitioner failed to respond to the summons and warrants. Ultimately, proceedings for declaring her a proclaimed person were initiated

2026:PHHC:082898



and she was declared as such on 30.08.2024. She was arrested on 27.03.2026. On interrogation, she suffered a disclosure statement to the effect that she was a travel agent and had sent the daughter of the complainant to Muscat by taking a sum of Rs.60,000/- out of which an amount of Rs.20,000/- was kept by her. Offence under Section 201 of IPC was added. Investigation now stands concluded.

4. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that she has been falsely implicated in this case. She had not even been specifically named in the FIR and was named as an accomplice of the co-accused. Infact, the daughter of the complainant had borrowed a sum of Rs.20,000/- from her for the purpose of buying an air ticket for going abroad and had given back to her. She had no role to play in the commission of the subject offence. The trial will take considerable time to conclude. Her further incarceration will not serve any useful purpose. It is, therefore, argued that she deserves to be released on bail.

5. Per contra, learned State counsel has argued that the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. The daughter of the complainant has not returned so far. The petitioner facilitated fraudulent transaction along with the co-accused. There are chances of her fleeing or committing similar offences, if extended benefit of bail. It is, therefore, argued that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

6. This Court has considered the rival submissions.

7. The petitioner along with the co-accused is alleged to have

2026:PHHC:082898



duped the complainant of money. She is also alleged to have sent the daughter of the complainant to Muscat by misrepresenting that she would be provided a job in some Parlour in Muscat. The allegations against her are specific in nature. She is in custody since 27.03.2026. The trial will take considerable time to conclude. The subject offences are triable by Magistrate. Further incarceration of the petitioner would not serve any useful purpose. The well settled proposition of law is that pre trial incarceration of an accused should not be a replica of post conviction sentencing. The detention prior to trial should not become punitive. Taking into consideration the above discussed facts, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be admitted to bail subject to her furnishing personal bonds as well as surety bonds by two sureties in the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/CJM/Duty Magistrate concerned and on the following conditions:-

- (i) The petitioner shall not leave the country under any circumstance without permission of the learned trial Court.
- (ii) She shall appear before the trial Court on each and every date fixed, unless is exempted by specific order of the Court.
- (iii) She shall provide her permanent address as well as present address before the learned trial Court at the time of furnishing of bonds and shall not change the same

2026:PHHC:082898



without informing the trial Court.

(iv) She shall also give copy of her Aadhar Card, PAN Card if any and details of her mobile phone number(s) to the learned trial Court at the time of furnishing of bonds and in case, any change in her mobile phone number takes place, then she shall inform about the same to the learned trial Court in advance and shall keep her mobile phone switch on all times.

(v) She shall deposit her passport, if any, with the learned trial Court.

8. In the eventuality of breach of any of the aforementioned conditions, the respondent-State shall be at liberty to move an application seeking cancellation of the bail.

9. It is made clear that any observation made herein above is only for the purpose of deciding the present petition and the same shall have no bearing on the merits of the case.

26.05.2026
manju

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No