



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

**CRM-M-36023-2025**

**Reserved on: 1<sup>st</sup> August, 2025**

**Pronounced on: 7<sup>th</sup> August, 2025**

Joginder Kaur @ Jogindri

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA**

Present: Mr. Chandan Singh Rana, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Sakshi Bakshi, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab.

\*\*\*

**MANISHA BATRA, J :-**

The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') by the petitioner seeking grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 112 dated 15.05.2025 registered under Sections 123 and 62 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNS') at Police Station Sidhwan Bet, District Ludhiana, Rural.

2. As per the allegations, on 15.05.2025, a secret information was received that the petitioner was indulged in sale of illicit liquor prepared from poisonous/unhealthy substances and, if raided immediately, she could be apprehended with large quantity of such liquor. Believing this information to be true, intimation was immediately sent to police station by the raiding party for registration of FIR. The police party, headed by ASI



Sukhwinder Singh, rushed towards the house of the petitioner and apprehended her. One cane containing illicit liquor was recovered from her, on measuring, it was found to be 20 bottles of illicit liquor. Samples were taken and were deposited with chemical examiner and the same were found to be of illicit liquor. Investigation now stands completed and Challan has been presented before the concerned Court.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that she has been falsely implicated in this case. A false recovery has been planted upon her. She has been in custody since long. The subject offences are triable by Magistrate. Her further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose. Therefore, it is argued that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. Status report has been filed. Learned State counsel has argued that the petitioner is a habitual offender being involved in three more cases of similar nature. There are chances of her committing similar offences or absconding, if extended benefit of bail. Therefore, it is urged that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length and have gone through the record carefully.

6. The petitioner is alleged to be apprehended with illicit liquor. She has been in custody since 15.05.2025. Trial will take time to conclude. Her involvement in other cases cannot be considered to be the sole reason for denying benefit of bail to her. Taking into consideration the above discussed facts but without meaning to make any comment upon the merits of the case, I am of the considered opinion that the petition deserves to be



allowed. Hence, the same is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to her furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned.

7. Since the main petition has been allowed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

**[MANISHA BATRA]**  
**JUDGE**

**7<sup>th</sup> August, 2025**

*Parveen Sharma*

<i>1. Whether speaking/ reasoned</i>	:	<i>Yes / No</i>
<i>2. Whether reportable</i>	:	<i>Yes / No</i>