



CRM-M-28332 of 2025

-1-

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

217

CRM-M-28332 of 2025  
Date of Decision: 26.08.2025

Pooja Rani

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL**

Present: Mr. Anil Mehta, Advocate and  
Mr. Nishant Indal, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Satvir Mander, AAG, Punjab.

\*\*\*\*\*

**RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J (ORAL)**

1. Prayer in the instant petition filed under Section 483 of the Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.04 dated 16.01.2025 registered under Sections 420, 465, 466, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B IPC, at Police Station Sarabha Nagar, District Police Commissionerate Ludhiana.
2. The case was registered on the statement of one Sukhbir Singh-complainant, who stated that the petitioner hatched criminal conspiracy with other co-accused, namely, Pinder Sodhi and Ramdas, cheated him for huge amount of money by misrepresenting and defrauded him through forged documents.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He argued that neither the



**CRM-M-28332 of 2025**

**-2-**

petitioner was named in the FIR nor she has committed any such offence. The petitioner is in custody since 21.01.2025. The investigation in the case is complete and challan has also been filed. There are total 14 prosecution witnesses and none has been examined till date and as such, the trial may take a long time to conclude and no useful purpose would be served by keeping him behind the bars. Further, co-accused Ramdas had already been granted the concession of anticipatory bail by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court passed in CRM-M-8076-2025, vide order dated 27.05.2025. Therefore, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Learned State counsel, who has appeared on advance notice of the petition, filed the custody certificate of the petitioner, which is taken on record. He has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail, stating that the offence committed by the petitioner is serious in nature. He has further submitted that the petitioner has involved in two more cases of similar nature. However, he has not controverted the fact that she is on bail in both the said cases.

6. This Court is sanguine of the fact that according to the proposition settled by the Apex Court in ***Dataram Singh vs. State of Uttar Pradesh & Anr. 2018(2) R.C.R. (Criminal) 131***, that keeping somebody behind the bars, till his guilt is proved, for an indefinite period amounts to infringement of his right to life and liberty, as enshrined under Article 21 of Constitution of India and is against the principle “*bail is a rule*” and “*jail is an exception*”.

7. Having heard learned counsel for the parties at length and after perusing the record of the case, it is found that the petitioner is in custody for

**CRM-M-28332 of 2025****-3-**

the last more than 07 months and the trial may take a long time to conclude, no useful purpose would be served by detaining her in further custody. Keeping the petitioner in further detention without the prospect of the trial being concluded in the near future would be violative of her rights under Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

8. In view of the above, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on her furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/CJM concerned. It is clarified that nothing stated herein shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

**(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)**  
**JUDGE**

**26.08.2025**  
*D.Bansal*

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