

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-15426 of 2015
Date of Decision : 20.08.2015

Manjit Kaur and anotherPetitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and anotherRespondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R.P. NAGRATH

Present: Mr. M.S. Rakkar, Senior Advocate with
Mr. J.S. Virk, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Gazi Mohd., DAG, Punjab.

R.P. Nagrath, J. (Oral)

Prayer in the instant petition is for grant of anticipatory bail under Section 438 Cr.P.C. in Complaint No. 21801 RO/144182007 dated 26.11.2007 titled "Sarup Singh vs. Shyam Singh and others" for offence under Sections 302, 148, 149 and 120-B of Indian Penal Code (IPC), Police Station Civil Lines, Patiala, pending in the Judicial Magistrate, Patiala.

When the matter was listed on 19.05.2015, the following order was passed:-

"It is inter alia contended that petitioner No. 1- Manjit Kaur is the wife of Jaspal Singh (deceased) and petitioner No. 2-Savitri Devi is the mother of petitioner No. 1. It is further contended that marriage of petitioner No. 1 with Jaspal Singh (deceased) was solemnized on 04.03.1999 and they have two children from the wedlock. It is also contended that the children are residing with their mother. It is further contended that Jaspal Singh (deceased) was a Constable in the Police Department and was living separately from the family and died un-natural death on 07.12.2005. It is also

contended that petitioner No. 1 in fact got the job on compassionate grounds on account of death of her husband in the Police Department. It is further contended that a complaint with similar allegations was filed before the police and it was thoroughly investigated. It is also contended that now the summoning order was passed in a private complaint.

Notice of motion for 20.08.2015.

In the meanwhile, on appearance of the petitioners before the Committing Court on 04.06.2015, they shall be admitted to bail on furnishing bail bonds to its satisfaction. Till 04.06.2015 arrest of the petitioners shall remain stayed.

In case, petitioners fail to do so, the concession granted to them by this order shall automatically stands vacated.”

Learned senior counsel for petitioners submits that petitioners have appeared before the trial Court and furnished the bail bonds to the satisfaction of trial Court.

In view of the above and without commenting on merits of the case, the interim order dated 19.05.2015 is made absolute. The bail bonds furnished before the trial Court in terms of interim directions shall continue during pendency of trial.

Allowed in the above terms.

August 20, 2015
jk

(R.P. NAGRATH)
JUDGE