



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

207

**CRM-M-42250-2025
Date of decision: 13.10.2025**

DEEPIKA ALIAS DEEPAPetitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJABRespondent

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

Present: - Ms. Deepika, Advocate with
Mr. Ravi Mishra, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Senior DAG, Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of The Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for the grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 222 dated 12.12.2023, registered under Section(s) 370(4), 363, 363-A, 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



CRM-M-42250-2025

-2-

engaged in the business of kidnapping children and thereafter selling them 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 the petitioner has been nominated as an accused on the basis of disclosure statement of one Paramjit who had in fact been nominated in the disclosure statement of Rajni. She submits that co-accused Rajni has already been granted the concession of regular bail by this Court vide order dated 31.07.2025 passed in CRM-M-55887-2024

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 stage of trial as well as by extending a parity to the petitioner at par with co-accused Rajni, to whom concession of regular bail has been allowed vide order dated 31.07.2025, I deem it appropriate to enlarge the petitioner on regular bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court.



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.

OCTOBER 13, 2025

Vishal Sharma

**(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE**

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