



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

**CRM-M-61410-2025
Date of decision : 11.03.2026**

Ritu Bala

.....Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Inderjit Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Raj Karan Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Rahul Garg, Advocate
for the complainant.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J.

1. Present petition has been filed by the petitioner praying for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.30 dated 16.03.2019, under Sections 420, 465, 468, 120-B of IPC, registered at Police Station Mukerian, District Hoshiarpur.

2. Succinctly facts of the case are that the FIR has been lodged on the statement of complainant-Gurvinder Kaur. It was alleged that she has two sons, namely, Jaspreet Singh and Harpreet Singh and both were in search of the job. It was alleged that Dr. Gurjit Singh and Dr. Ritu (petitioner) were on visiting terms and occasionally visited each other at their respective residences. It was further alleged that in the month of April/May, 2015, Dr. Gurjit Singh and Dr. Ritu had visited the house of her brother-in-law and coincidentally, complainant had also gone there along with her sons. They asked her sons as to what they were doing and they replied that they were in search of some job. Then, they said if my son Jaspreet Singh is interested, they can provide him job in Government



Department MES and for that purpose, they demanded Rs.7,00,000/- from the complainant in which half of the amount was asked paid in advance and remaining amount after getting the work done, with the assurance that they will provide job to her son within 3-4 months. Thereafter, the complainant has paid Rs.3,50,000/- to Dr. Gurjit Singh and Dr. Ritu. Thereafter, both of them called her son Jaspreet Singh at Hospital and directed him to reach at Bus Stand, Pathankot. Her son along with one Manpreet Singh reached at Pathankot where Dr. Gurjit Singh was already there along with one unknown women. There were some other boys as well and all filled their forms. After 5-6 months, they again called her son Jaspreet Singh to Chandigarh and got conducted his dope test and after 02 months, they hand over two training letters to her son out of which, one was regarding Indian Army and another was pertaining to MES Department, which were forged. In this manner, time and again, on one pretext or another, the accused allured the complainant and her sons and thereby committed fraud of Rs.3,59,000/- by duping them on the pretext of providing jobs to the sons of the complainant. Hence, request was made to take legal action against the culprits. On registration of the FIR, investigation commenced. Petitioner was arrested on 27.09.2025. On completion of the investigation challan was presented, charges were framed and on framing of charges, trial commenced. Petitioner approached the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Hoshiarpur praying for the grant of bail however, the same was declined vide order dated 17.10.2025. Hence, being aggrieved, petitioner is before this Court praying for grant of bail.

3. It has been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He has



submitted that on registration of the FIR, thorough and fair investigation was conducted and thereafter, the petitioner was exonerated by the Investigating Agency as the allegations against her were not substantiated. He has submitted that during the trial, the petitioner was summoned under Section 319 Cr.P.C. He has further submitted that the petitioner was arrested on 27.09.2025 and thereafter, on medical ground, she was granted interim bail on 22.12.2025. He has submitted that once the petitioner has been exonerated by the Investigating Agency, it is apparent that the petitioner was falsely implicated. He has also submitted that investigation is already complete, charges have been framed and after having been granted interim bail, the petitioner has not misused the concession of interim bail granted to him vide order dated 22.12.2025. He thus, has submitted that the interim bail granted to her though on medical ground but the same be made absolute keeping in view the merits of the case.

4. Learned counsel for the complainant has however, opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted that there are specific allegations against the petitioner that she is involved in 05 other cases.

5. Learned State counsel, on the other hand, has opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner, however, he has not controverted the fact that during investigation, the petitioner was found innocent and thereafter, she has been summoned under Section 319 Cr.P.C. On instructions, he has submitted that out of 12 prosecution witnesses, only 03 witnesses have been examined so far.

6. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that after registration of the FIR, the petitioner was declared innocent and during the trial, she has been summoned under



Section 319 Cr.P.C. The petitioner though is facing prosecution in other cases as well however, she is on bail in those cases. Needless to say that this Court had granted interim bail to the petitioner on medical ground vide order dated 22.12.2025, however, on hearing the merits of the case, this is an admitted position that in the present case, she has been summoned under Section 319 Cr.P.C. As submitted, out of 12 prosecution witnesses, 03 witnesses already stand examined.

7. The trial of the case will take sufficiently long time. Thus, keeping in view the overall facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail. Accordingly, interim bail granted vide order dated 22.12.2025 is made absolute to her already furnished surety/bail bonds before the trial Court and the same shall be treated as alive till the final disposal of the trial. The petitioner is directed to keep on appearing before the trial Court as and when required to do so and also to comply with the direction of the trial Court given by it during the pendency of the trial. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

11.03.2026
m.sharma

(**RAJESH BHARDWAJ**)
JUDGE

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