

2025:PHHC:129254



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

218

**CRM-M-51430-2025
Date of decision: 17.09.2025**

SURINDER KAUR

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present: - Ms. Neha Randhawa, Advocate for
Mr. Sandeep Saini, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Senior DAG, Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

The instant second petition is for seeking concession of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 222 dated 12.12.2023 registered under Sections 370(4), 363, 363-A and 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station Balongi, District S.A.S. Nagar, Mohali.

2. The facts of the present petition, as borne out from the record, are that on 12.12.2023, a police party headed by ASI Surinder Singh was present near Balongi bridge in connection with patrolling and checking of anti-social elements, when secret information was received that Surinder Kaur, wife of Parvinder Singh, and Darshana Rani, wife of Jeet Ram, were engaged in the business of kidnapping children and thereafter selling them



CRM-M-51430-2025

-2-

for the purpose of begging. It was further disclosed that on the said day, both accused were on their way to Spice Chowk, Mohali, with the intention of selling a small child. Acting upon this information, the present FIR came to be registered, and both accused were apprehended. During investigation, accused Darshana Rani made a disclosure statement stating that the child recovered from her and co-accused Surinder Kaur had been handed over to them by Gurwinder Kaur @ Gurleen Kaur.

3. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that out of total 19 witnesses, only 01 witness has been examined so far. The petitioner has undergone an actual custody of 01 year, 08 months and 29 days. He contends that co-accused of the petitioner has already been granted concession of regular bail vide order dated 04.09.2025 passed in CRM-M-40933-2025 titled as "*Darshana Rani versus State of Punjab*".

4. Counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent-State does not dispute the aforesaid facts.

5. I have heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respective parties.

6. In view of the facts noticed above and taking into consideration the period of custody, the stage of the trial as well as by extending a parity to the petitioner at par with co-accused Darshana Rani, to whom concession of regular bail has been allowed vide order dated 04.09.2025, I deem it appropriate to enlarge the petitioner on regular bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

**CRM-M-51430-2025**

-3-

7. The instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on her furnishing requisite bail bond/surety bond to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

8. It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witnesses in any manner directly or indirectly.

9. The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the Trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

SEPTEMBER 17, 2025*Vishal Sharma***(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether Reportable : Yes/No