

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-33381-2015 (O & M)
Date of decision:19.11.2015

Baljeet Kaur ...Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana ...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJAN GUPTA

Present: Mr. P.K. Ganga, Advocate,
for the petitioner(s).

Dr. Sushil Gautam, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. S.S. Gill, Advocate,
for the complainant.

Rajan Gupta, J. (oral)

This is a petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. seeking pre-arrest bail to petitioner in a case registered against her vide FIR No.613 dated 07.08.2015 under Sections 420, 406, 120-B IPC at Police Station City Sirsa.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that petitioner has no role to play in commission of crime. She was merely instrumental in the matrimonial alliance of complainant-Devender Singh with Daljit Kaur. She, thus, deserves the concession of anticipatory bail.

Prayer has been opposed by learned State counsel. According to him, petitioner is a member of a gang who arranged fake marriages in Ludhiana. In the instant case, after arranging the marriage, she took away all the house-hold articles and later demanded a sum of ₹1 lac from the husband which was also paid.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties.

Allegations are that accused including the petitioner hatched a conspiracy and promised the complainant-Devender Singh that his marriage would be solemnized on May 11, 2015 with Daljit Kaur. The lady-Daljit Kaur was introduced to Devender Singh as Suman. Marriage was solemnized. As the marriage was also fake, Daljit Kaur left after four days. Meanwhile, Baljeet Kaur, petitioner herein, demanded a sum of ₹ 1 lac from the complainant on the pretext that amount was required for treatment of her father. Allegedly, this amount of ₹ 1 lac was given to the petitioner and another amount of ₹ 15,000/- was deposited in the account of brother of Daljit Kaur. Later, the complainant came to know that he had been duped as, in fact, there had been no marriage at all.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case, petitioner does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail as her custodial interrogation may be necessary which shall take the investigation to its logical end.

Dismissed.

19.11.2015
sukhpreet

(RAJAN GUPTA)
JUDGE