

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

**Criminal Misc. No. M-31131 of 2015
Date of decision: 14.09.2015**

Manjeet Kaur

..Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE DAYA CHAUDHARY

- 1. Whether reporters of local newspapers may be allowed to see judgment? Yes/No**
- 2. To be referred to reporters or not? Yes/No**
- 3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest? Yes/No**

Present: Mr. Karanjit Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Daya Chaudhary, J. (Oral)

The present petition has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner-Manjeet Kaur in case FIR No.116 dated 18.08.2015 registered under Sections 406, 498-A, 506, 376, 120-B read with Section 34 of Indian Penal Code at Police Station Gharinda, District Amritsar Rural.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the case whereas the allegations are only of demand of dowry against her and she has nothing to do with the allegations of rape. Learned counsel also submits that earlier a complaint was made by the father of the prosecutrix and subsequently, there was improvement.

Heard arguments of learned counsel for the petitioner and have also perused the allegations levelled in the FIR.

Not only allegations of demand of dowry are there but as per allegations in the FIR, the petitioner, who is mother-in-law of the prosecutrix, in connivance with other accused hatched a conspiracy and Satnam Singh, who is brother-in-law (Jeth) of the prosecutrix, took her to Amritsar in the car. Thereafter, said car was sent back through a relative and she was taken by train to Delhi where she was kept under threat for 2-3 days and rape was committed by accused-Satnam Singh upon her. It has also been alleged in the FIR that the accused-Satnam Singh has told the prosecutrix that he has got consent from his mother and with her consent, she was taken to Amritsar and Delhi as the husband of the complainant was away to Italy.

The specific allegations of conspiracy are there against the petitioner and moreover, Sections 34 and 120-B IPC are also there and as such, individual role is not to be seen. Hence, keeping in view the allegations levelled against the present petitioner and the seriousness of the offence, no ground is made out to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

Dismissed.

14.09.2015
neetu

(DAYA CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE