



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

Sr. No.104+278

CRM-32529-2025 in/and
CRM-M-43032-2025 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 20.08.2025

Harpreet Kaur

.... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA

Present: Mr. Arpan Sabharwal, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Satjot Singh Chahal, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab.

TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA, J. (ORAL)

CRM-32529-2025

Application is allowed and Section 7(A) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988, is added to the offences alleged against the petitioner in the head note as well as prayer clause of the petition.

CRM-M-43032-2025

The petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023, seeking grant of regular bail in case FIR No.23 dated 14.05.2025, registered under Section 7 of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988, and Section 61(2) BNSS [Sections 238 and 308(2) BNSS have been added later on], at P.S. Vigilance Bureau Range Jalandhar, District Jalandhar.

2. The FIR in question was lodged on a complaint of Engineers and Building Designer Association, Jalandhar, Punjab, through its President,



alleging illegal demand of money by Assistant Town Planner (ATP) Sukhdev Vashisht for approving the building plans and inspecting the building, etc.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that there is no allegation of demanding any money against the petitioner in the FIR. During investigation, statement of a witness Sanjeev Duggal was recorded to the effect that the petitioner, who is working as a Building Planner, also demanded bribe of ₹3 lakh from him in September/October 2024, and on that basis, she was nominated as an accused in the case on 28.05.2025. She was arrested the next day and sent to judicial custody on 01.06.2025. It is a case of false implication and allegations against the petitioner are motivated. She had lodged a complaint against Sanjeev Duggal regarding unauthorised use of building, upon which a DDR dated 06.01.2025 had also been recorded. He further submits that co-accused, Mahesh Makhija, who is facing similar allegations, has already been released on regular bail by the trial Court vide order dated 08.08.2025. Investigation of the case is already over, and the petitioner is no longer required. Her medical condition also requires her to be released from custody as she is six months pregnant.

4. Learned State counsel, on instructions, contends that there is no dispute that the petitioner has been subsequently nominated as an accused on the statement of a witness, nor that she earlier complained against that witness, regarding which a DDR has also been recorded. Her medical condition is also not denied as she is pregnant. He, however, contends that challan in the case has already been presented in Court on 19.07.2025, and there are ninety prosecution witnesses. Since the allegations are serious in nature, the petitioner should not be released on bail.

5. Submissions made by learned counsel for the parties have been considered.



6. Considering the medical condition of the petitioner, as also the fact that charges are still to be framed and there are ninety prosecution witnesses to be examined which will take some time, it is deemed appropriate to release her from custody.

7. Accordingly, petition is allowed and the petitioner is directed to be released on regular bail subject to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

(TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA)
JUDGE

20.08.2025
Maninder

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