



2026:PHHC:059823

-1-

2026:PHHC:059823



CRM-M-14354-2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

158

CRM-M-14354-2026
Date of decision: 21.04.2026

MANJIT KAUR

....Petitioner

Versus

RANJIT KAUR

....Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL

Present:- Mr. G.S. Bajwa Advocate for the petitioner.

RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 528 of BNSS (Section 482 of CrPC) for quashing of order dated 28.01.2026 passed by the Ld. Additional Sessions Judge, Amritsar vide which application moved by the petitioner for extension of time for furnishing surety bonds was dismissed (Annexure P-4) arising out of CRA No. 251 of 2025 titled as "*Manjit Kaur Vs. Ranjit Kaur*".

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was convicted by the learned Trial Court in a complaint under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act and sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for one year, against which an appeal has already been preferred and vide order dated 04.09.2025, the sentence of the petitioner was suspended subject to furnishing bonds in the sum of Rs. 50,000/- with one surety of like amount within 30 days. However, the petitioner could not arrange surety and filed for extension of time whereby the learned Appellate Court vide order dated 17.10.2025 extended the time for furnishing bail bonds within a period of 07



CRM-M-14354-2026

days. He contends that the petitioner belongs to a poor strata of society and could not arrange surety bonds within the extended time and again moved an application for extension of time for furnishing surety bonds, which was dismissed by the learned Appellate Court vide the impugned order. Hence, learned counsel for the petitioner prays that in the peculiar facts of the present case, the present petition be allowed.

3. Heard.

4. Upon perusal of the paper-book, it is forthcoming that despite earlier extension granted the learned Appellate Court, vide order dated 24.10.2025, the petitioner has failed to comply with the directions of the Court. However, still this Court is inclined to take a lenient view. Thus, the impugned order dated 28.01.2026 is hereby quashed and the petitioner is granted 04 weeks time to furnish surety bonds as per the directions given by the learned Appellate Court subject to payment of Rs.10,000/- as costs to be deposited by the petitioner in Poor Patients Welfare Fund, PGIMER, Chandigarh.

5. The present petition is disposed of accordingly.

21.04.2026

Mohit Bishnoi

(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)
JUDGE

i)	Whether speaking/reasoned?	Yes/No
ii)	Whether reportable?	Yes/No