

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

CRM-M-33165-2016 (O&M)
Date of decision : 13.12.2016

Parveen

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. Liaqat Ali, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Harsimrat Rai, DAG, Punjab,
assisted by ASI Rakesh Kumar.

Mr. S.S. Narula, Advocate,
for the complainant.

JITENDRA CHAUHAN, J. (Oral)

CRM-39124-2016

For the reasons recorded in the CRM application, the same is allowed and complainant-applicant, Dr. Jaswant Singh Thind is impleaded as respondent No.2. The amended memo of parties appended with the application is also taken on record.

CRM-39125-2016

Allowed as prayed for, subject to all just exceptions.

Main case

The petitioner seeks pre-arrest bail in FIR No.55 dated 05.06.2016, registered under Sections 381 and 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, at Police Station Division No.6, Jalandhar.

It is contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in

the instant case as she had been working as maid with the complainant. The petitioner is not seen in the CCTV and night vision cameras. On 07.06.2016, she was taken to Tehsil Complex, in custody by the police, and was pressurized to execute two sale deeds with regard to their house measuring six marlas, in favour of Sajjan Sharma and Salinder Partap, who are employees of the complainant.

Learned State counsel, on instructions, states that though the petitioner has joined the investigation but the recovery is yet to be effected.

Learned counsel for the complainant vehemently opposes the instant petition. He states that the petitioner along with his co-accused has stolen approximately Rupees forty lakh. It is further contended that on further exploration of the CCTV footage, co-accused Ekta was spotted. He, however, candidly admits that the petitioner is not seen in the CCTV footage.

Heard.

On a query put by the Court, learned State counsel fairly concedes that though, a lady is seen in the CCTV footage, but it is not clear whether she was carrying any amount or not. The petitioner has been in the employment of the complainant. She is not seen in the CCTV footage. She has repeatedly joined the investigation in terms of the order passed by this Court.

Accordingly, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the interim bail granted by this Court vide order dated 19.09.2016, is made absolute, subject to furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned.

The petition stands allowed.

However, nothing noticed hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion of this Court, on the merits of the case.

13.12.2016
atulsethi

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking / reasoned :	Yes	Nox
Whether Reportable :	Yes	No