

State Vs. Sandeep Kaur

CIS No: BA-238-2025

FIR No.93 dated 19.12.2024
under Sections 318(4), 338, 336(2),
340, 61(2) BNS
Police Station Sherpur.

Present: Sh MS Khurmi, Advocate for accused/applicant.
Ms. Gagandeep Kaur, APP for the State.

1. This order shall dispose of an application filed by the accused/applicant namely Sandeep Kaur for releasing her on bail.

2. In this application, Learned counsel for accused/applicant stated that the accused/applicant is peace loving and law-abiding citizen and has not committed any offence. It is further submitted that the present application is first regular bail application of the applicant and no other regular bail application after arrest of applicant is pending or has been decided by any court of competent jurisdiction. It is further submitted that the applicant has not committed any offence and her name has been inserted in the present case by only to shield some other accused person but the same is a false story. It is further submitted that the police had registered the case on the statement of some persons who alleged that they invested some money with the applicant's family. So, if the allegations are taken on face value, then it was only a civil matter. It is further submitted that the applicant has not returned money then the applicants can file civil proceeding. It is further submitted that other accused of the case has been granted regular bail by the court of JMIC, Dhuri. It is further submitted that the applicant has not committed any offence and no recovery is pending against the applicant. It is further submitted that the applicant is in judicial custody. It is further submitted that for recovery of money invested in

(Amandeep Kaur)
Judicial Magistrate Ist Class,
Dhuri UID No.PB0607

business can't be ground for criminal litigation. It is further submitted that the applicant is mother of a small child. It is further submitted that the police registered four different FIRs against on the same matter by taking applications from different persons just to keep the applicant behind bars for long time. It is further submitted that the other accused are on bail in all FIRs. It is further submitted that the applicant is neither required for any custodial interrogation, nor any recovery has to be got effected from the applicant. It is further submitted that the applicant will not misuse or abuse the concession of bail if that is granted to her. It is further submitted that the applicant shall abide by all terms and conditions imposed by the court and shall not leave India without prior permission of the Hon'ble Court. It is further submitted that accused/applicant is ready to furnish the bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Court. Lastly, a prayer has been made for allowing the present application.

3. Along with the bail application an affidavit has also been filed by Harpreet Singh brother of accused/applicant, wherein, it has been deposed that this is the first bail application on behalf of accused/applicant and no such bail application has been filed in any Court of law nor disposed by any court even in the Punjab and Haryana High Court, Chandigarh.

4. Notice of the bail application was sent to the learned APP for the State for today itself. No reply has been filed by the learned APP, but he vehemently opposed the bail application of applicant/accused.

5. Report of Ahlmad seen. He has reported that no bail application of accused has been filed or decided by any Court.

6. Perusal of report submitted by SHO PS Sherpur reveals that

the present FIR was registered by the complainant Jagjit Singh against accused. The complainant has submitted that accused persons, namely Ramandeep Singh, Sandeep Kaur, Satnam Singh and Harbhajan Singh had conned the complainant on the pretext in investing in committees and has duped for money. He has further submitted that accused Ramandeep Singh and his family runs cloth shop under the name and style of Harbhajan Singh and sons. He has further submitted that when he use to visit the shop of Harbhajan Singh and sons for purchasing clothes, accused Ramandeep Singh his father Harbhajan Singh and his brother Satnam Singh used to asked the complainant to invest in committees. The complainant has further submitted that at around one and half year earlier one store in the name and style of 99 was also opened by the wife of accused Ramandeep Singh. He further stated that he invested in the committees on the asking of his friend Hardeep Singh and he had invested in two committees of Rs.4,80,000/- each in May 2023 in which he used to pay installments of Rs.30,000/- per committee and had paid all the installments of the said committees. The said committees were to be matured on 15.08.2024. He further stated that accused Ramandeep Singh used to give forged and fabricated receipt of the installments deposited. Lastly, complainant submitted that accused Ramandeep Singh, Sandeep Kaur, Satnam Singh and Harbhajan Singh with intention to con has duped and committed fraud upon for the complainant for money and accordingly, requested the necessary legal action against accused Ramandeep Singh, Sandeep Kaur,

(Amandeep Kaur)
Judicial Magistrate Ist Class,
Dhuri UID No.PB0607

Satnam Singh and Harbhajan Singh be taken.

7. Perusal of remand papers reveals that accused Sandeep Kaur was arrested on 22.10.2025 and she is in judicial custody since 23.10.2025. In the light of the facts of the present case and report submitted by the investigating agency and arguments advanced by the prosecution and defence, it is coming out that the allegation have been specifically made against accused Ramandeep Singh who on the pretext of investment have conned the complainant and after conning has absconded. Further, perusal of police report reveals that no specific allegations against accused Sandeep Kaur has come-forth and the complainant has merely submitted that sometime, he used to deposit installment amounts with Sandeep Kaur. Further, the complainant submitted that he has invested in number of committees and invested money with the accused Ramandeep Singh. The source of said investment has also to be established by the prosecution. Furthermore, there is nothing stated by the prosecution which is to be recovered from the accused/applicant who are in custody from 23.10.2025. Therefore, no useful purpose will be served by keeping the accused/applicant behind bars. Furthermore, no specific allegations of the conduct of the accused Sandeep Kaur has been attributed by the investigating agency, neither complainant has leveled any specific allegation against the accused Sandeep Kaur regarding the alleged racketeering. Additionally, in the police report brief it is mentioned that accused Sandeep Kaur got recovered gold ornaments kept by accused Ramandeep Singh and a sum of Rs. 6,45,000/- entrusted with her by accused Ramandeep Singh. The conclusion of trial will take its own time. Judicial custody of the accused is rather a burden on the state exchequer. Moreover, the Hon'ble Supreme

(Amandeep Kaur)
Judicial Magistrate Ist Class,
Dhuri UID No.PB0607

Court speaking through Justice *VaidyanaThapuram Rama Krishan Iyer in State of Rajasthan Vs. Bal Chand @ Baliay in 1978* has laid down cannon of the criminal jurisprudence that ‘Bail is the rule and Jail is an exception’. It was also held, ‘the basic rule may perhaps be tersely put as bail, not jail’. In view of the above discussion and keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, the present bail application is allowed and the accused/applicant Sandeep Kaur is directed to be released on furnishing bail bonds of Rs.50,000/- with one surety of the like amount.

8. Bail bonds/ surety bonds not furnished. Papers attached with main file/remand papers.

Dated: 21.11.2025

(Amandeep Kaur)
Judicial Magistrate Ist Class,
Dhuri UID No.PB0607

(Amandeep Kaur)
Judicial Magistrate Ist Class,
Dhuri UID No.PB0607