

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

CRM-M-28585 of 2016.
Decided on:-19.08.2016.

Kamaljit Kaur @ Kamal.

.....Petitioner.

Versus

State of Punjab.

.....Respondent.

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARI PAL VERMA.

Present:- Mr. B.S. Jatana, Advocate
for the petitioner.

HARI PAL VERMA, J.

Prayer in this petition filed under Section 438 Cr.PC is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.189 dated 24.11.2015 under Sections 420, 342, 384, 506, 148 and 149 IPC registered at Police Station Canal Colony, District Bathinda.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the co-accused, namely, Ranjit Kaur, Vijay Kumar and Dharminder Singh @ Gharu have been released on anticipatory bail by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Bathinda. Even the petitioner was granted interim bail, but since she could not join investigation due to her illness, her bail application was dismissed as withdrawn on 19.1.2016. There is no evidence against the petitioner on the basis of which her name can be connected for the offence allegedly committed by her and nothing is to be recovered from her.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner.

Perusal of the FIR shows that when the petitioner failed to succeed in getting the LCD from the shop of complainant Pardeep Kumar on installments basis, she along with other co-accused has committed the offence as stated in the FIR. The petitioner is the main accused, who has called the complainant to her house at Baba Deep Singh Nagar, Bathinda and later on, called her male associates to the said house. The complainant was given severe beatings and the petitioner along with other co-accused has asked the complainant to pay an amount of Rs.3 lacs by intimidating him that in case the said amount is not given, a criminal case for outraging the modesty of the petitioner shall be fastened against him. The complainant in order to save his life and reputation called one of his friend Pankaj Goyal, who paid an amount of Rs.30,000/-, but still the accused asked the complainant to give the remaining amount. The allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature, and do not warrant relief of anticipatory bail.

In view of the above, this Court does not find any reason to admit the petitioner on anticipatory bail. Accordingly, the present petition is hereby dismissed.

August 19, 2016

Yag Dutt

**(HARI PAL VERMA)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes / No

Whether Reportable: Yes / No