

**CRM-M-29192-2016 and
CRM-M-30501-2016**

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

Date of Decision:24.10.2016

1. CRM-M-29192-2016

Satpal Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

AND

2. CRM-M-30501-2016

Manjit Kaur @ Surinder Kaur

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

Present: Mr. P.P.S.Duggall, Advocate,
for the petitioners in both the petitions.

Ms. Shivali, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Rajesh Kapila, Advocate,
for the complainant.

INDERJIT SINGH, J.

This order shall dispose of CRM-M-29192-2016, filed by

**CRM-M-29192-2016 and
CRM-M-30501-2016**

Kaur @ Surinder Kaur, under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.87 dated 14.07.2016, registered at Police Station Ferozepur Cantt. District Ferozepur, under Sections 379 and 34 IPC and Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act.

Notice of motion was issued in both these petitions. Learned State counsel put in appearance on behalf of the respondent-State and the complainant also put in appearance through his counsel.

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 as per the prosecution version, vehicle make Ford Figo was given as dowry at the time of marriage, but as per the registration certificate, it is in the name of petitioner-Satpal Singh and it has been taken away by him (Satpal Singh). At the time of arguments, learned State counsel admitted that revolver is not in possession of the petitioners.

It *prima facie* appears to be a matrimonial dispute. In pursuance of the interim orders dated 23.08.2016 passed in CRM-M-29192-2016 and dated 31.08.2016 passed in CRM-M-30501-2016, the petitioners have already joined the investigation. They are now not required for custodial interrogation.

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 no useful purpose will

**CRM-M-29192-2016 and
CRM-M-30501-2016**

be served by sending the petitioners to custody, I find merit in these petitions and the same are allowed. The orders dated 23.08.2016 passed in CRM-M-29192-2016 and dated 31.08.2016 passed in CRM-M-30501-2016, granting interim bail to the petitioners, 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.

24.10.2016

parveen kumar

**(INDERJIT SINGH)
JUDGE**

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