



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

CRM-M-19739-2025 (O&M)

Date of Decision:12.08.2025

ASI Gurmeet Kaur

...Petitioner

vs.

State of Punjab

...Respondent

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat

Present : Mr. Ashish Aggarwal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ravneet Singh Joshi, DAG, Punjab.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

CRM-15959-2025

1. Application is allowed as prayed for, subject to just all exceptions.
2. Annexure P-5 is taken on record.

Main case

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 483 of B.N.S.S with a prayer to grant regular bail to her in case FIR No. 06, dated 13.02.2025, registered under Section 7 of Prevention of Corruption Act,1988 as amended by PC (Amendment) Act, 2018 (Section 7-A of P.C Act and Section 204 of B.N.S added later on), registered at Police Station Vigilance Bureau, Range, Amritsar, District Amritsar.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is working in police department for the last more than 25 years and is having unblemished service career. He next contends that in fact, the complainant had

falsely involved the petitioner as the petitioner had not favoured him in the enquiry, which was being conducted by her. He further contends that an amount of Rs.10,000/- was transferred to Harpreet Singh, co-accused and the petitioner had no connection with Harpreet Singh. She had neither demanded nor accepted any bribe from the complainant in the present case. The petitioner was arrested in the present case on 13.02.2025 and is in custody for the last more than six months. After completion of investigation, challan has been presented against her. However, charge has not been framed so far.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that serious allegations have been levelled against the present petitioner and she does not deserve the concession of bail by this Court.

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

5. It is an admitted fact that the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 06 months and even charge has not been framed against her. The prosecution has relied upon 18 witnesses and the conclusion of the trial may take quite a long time. Thus, further custody of the petitioner will not serve any meaningful purpose.

6. Without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on bail pending trial on her furnishing bail bonds and surety to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/ Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate.

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

12.08.2025
hitesh

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