

**CRM-M-27817-2016 and
CRM-M-28930-2016**

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

Date of Decision:07.09.2016

1. **CRM-M-27817-2016**

Dr. Monika Jindal

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

AND

2. **CRM-M-28930-2016**

Smt. Kanta Singla and another

... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

Present: Mr. Daldeep Singh, Advocate,
for the petitioner in CRM-M-27817-2016.

Mr. J.P.S.Chadha, Advocate,
for the petitioners in CRM-M-28930-2016.

Mr. Varun Sharma, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. N.S.Shekhawat, Advocate,
for the complainant.

INDERJIT SINGH, J.

Both the above mentioned petitions are taken up together being

arisen from same FIR.

**CRM-M-27817-2016 and
CRM-M-28930-2016**

Petitioners have filed these petitions under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.102 dated 18.07.2016, registered at Police Station Amloh, District Fatehgarh Sahib, under Sections 212, 120-B and 420 IPC.

Notice of motion was issued in both these petitions. Learned State counsel and learned counsel for the complainant appeared and contested these petitions.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioners; learned State counsel as well as learned counsel for the complainant and have gone through the record.

From the record, I find that FIR, in the present case, has been registered on the basis of application filed by complainant-Dr. Poonam Singla. As per the allegations, the complainant was married with Dr. Arvind Singla on 06.08.1998. Petitioner, Monika Jindal is sister-in-law whereas petitioners, Kanta Singla and Raj Kumar Singla are parents-in-law of the complainant.

Perusal of the FIR shows that main grievance of the complainant is against her husband, who has not paid the maintenance amount and even his conditional warrants have been issued. At the time of arguments, it is stated that husband of the complainant is in custody. Perusal of the FIR further shows that allegations against the petitioners, Monika Jindal, Kanta Singla and Raj Kumar Singla are only regarding connivance with the main accused and helping him. It is also argued that as per the compromise, no amount has been paid to the complainant. However, at the

**CRM-M-27817-2016 and
CRM-M-28930-2016**

time of arguments, it is admitted by learned counsel for the complainant that the petitioners herein have not signed the compromise. An FIR under Sections 498-A, 406, 323 and 34 IPC has already been registered separately.

In pursuance of the orders dated 11.08.2016 passed in CRM-M-27817-2016 and dated 22.08.2016 in CRM-M-28930-2016, the petitioners have already joined the investigation. They are not required for custodial interrogation. Nothing is to be recovered from them.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case; without discussing the facts of the case in minute details and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case and that no useful purpose will be served by sending the petitioners to custody, I find merit in these petitions and the same are allowed. The orders dated 11.08.2016 passed in CRM-M-27817-2016 and dated 22.08.2016 in CRM-M-28930-2016, granting interim bail to the petitioners, respectively, are made absolute. However, the petitioners shall join the investigation as and when called upon to do so and shall abide by the conditions of Section 438 (2) Cr.P.C.

07.09.2016

parveen kumar

**(INDERJIT SINGH)
JUDGE**

Note:	Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes
	Whether reportable	:	No