

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

(217)

CRM-M-14804-2015

Decided on: January 15, 2016.

Jasvir Kaur @ Rani

.... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

(2)

CRM-M-30957-2015

Decided on: January 15, 2016.

Satpal @ Ruldu

.... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.M.S. BEDI

Present: Mr. Malkeet Singh, Advocate,
for the petitioner in CRM-M-14804-2015.

Mr. Vipin Mahajan, Advocate,
for the petitioner in CRM-M-30957-2015.

Mr. Jashan Preet Singh, AAG, Punjab.

M.M.S. BEDI, J (ORAL)

This order will dispose of two applications for grant of regular bail, one (CRM-M-14804-2015) filed by Jasvir Kaur @ Rani and the other (CRM-M-30957-2015) filed by Satpal @ Ruldu.

As per the allegations FIR was registered at the instance of Ranjit Kumar @ Jitta alleging that both the petitioners along with two others had murdered the uncle of complainant Charanjit Singh by giving knife blows, when he came to rescue the complainant from the clutches of accused.

So far as petitioner Jasvir Kaur @ Rani is concerned, she has been attributed a 'lalkara' who had exhorted the main accused Sandeep Kumar @ Sonu who gave a knife blow on the chest of deceased Charanjit Singh. Similarly, petitioner Satpal @ Ruldu has been attributed a 'lalkara' to instigate the main accused Sandeep Kumar @ Sonu to kill Charanjit Singh.

Complainant Ranjit Kumar @ Jitta has already been examined on oath in the Court.

I have considered the facts and circumstances of the case.

The petitioners have been in custody w.e.f. 10.10.2014. No specific injury has been attributed to the petitioners. They have not even touched the deceased or the complainant.

Sharing common intention with the accused who had inflicted injuries resulting in death of Charanjit Singh would certainly be an arguable point during trial.

Taking into consideration the period of detention suffered by the petitioners and the fact that statements of all the material witnesses stand recorded, the petitioners can be granted concession of bail.

In view of said circumstances, both the petitions are allowed. Petitioners are ordered to be released on bail on their furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

Nothing said in this order will effect the merits of the case at the time of final decision.

(M.M.S. BEDI)
JUDGE

January 15, 2016
harsha