

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

CRM-M No. 18201 of 2016

Date of decision : August 31, 2016

Rani

..... Petitioner

v.

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI

Present : Ms. Manjeet Kaur, Advocate
for Mr. RK Arya, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Kuldeep Tiwari, Addl. AG Haryana

Ajay Tewari, J (Oral)

The petitioner seeks grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR
No.50, dated 2.4.2016, registered under Section 363 of the IPC, at Police
Station Pillukhera, District Jind.

On 24.5.2016, the following order was passed :-

“ Petitioner seeks concession of pre-arrest bail in
case FIR No.50 dated 02.04.2016, under Section 363
of Indian Penal Code (later on added Section
365/406/34 of IPC), registered at Police Station
Pillukhera, District Jind.

Counsel would submit that FIR has been
registered at the instance of Anand. Allegations are
against Sandeep who is alleged to have enticed the
wife of the complainant, namely, Pooja and in
connivance with each other have taken away the

motorcycle belonging to the complainant as also 05 golden rings, golden chain weighing 20 grams, 03 golden ear-rings and other gold ornaments and cash amount of Rs.25,000/-.

It is argued that name of the present petitioner does not even figure in the FIR. There are no allegations levelled by the complainant against the present petitioner. Present petitioner is stated to be implicated solely on the basis of a disclosure statement made by main accused Sandeep in police custody.

Notice of motion, returnable for 31.08.2016.

In the meanwhile, petitioner is directed to appear before the Investigating Officer and to join investigation.

In the event of arrest, the petitioner shall be released on interim bail subject to the satisfaction of the Arresting/Investigating Officer. The petitioner shall join investigation as and when called upon to do so and she shall remain bound by the conditions envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.”

Learned Addl. AG Haryana, on instructions from SI Suresh Kumar, states that the petitioner has joined the investigation but has denied that she has the ornaments or money.

Be that as it may, I do not deem it appropriate to deny the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Resultantly, this petition is allowed and the order dated 24.5.2016 is made absolute.

August 31, 2016
`kk'

(AJAY TEWARI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:
Whether Reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No