

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

**Crl. Misc. No.M-12879 of 2017 (O&M)
Date of Decision: November 06, 2017**

Jagrup Kaur

.....PETITIONER(s).

VERSUS

State of Punjab

....RESPONDENT(s).

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURINDER GUPTA

Present: Mr. Karan Pathak, Advocate
for the petitioner (s).

Mr. C.L.Pawar, Sr. D.A.G., Punjab.

Ms. Amarjeet Kaur, Advocate
for the complainant.

SURINDER GUPTA, J.(Oral)

The present petition has been filed under Section 438 Code of Criminal Procedure for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 3 dated 29.03.2017 registered for the offence punishable under Section 406 of Indian Penal Code at Police Station PS NRI, District SAS Nagar.

Heard.

The dispute was settled between the parties vide compromise dated 19.07.2017. As per term No. 2 of compromise, the jewellery given in marriage by both the parties was in possession of Sandeep Kaur and remaining jewellery which was in possession of petitioner-Jagrup Kaur is to be returned to the complainant along with Verna car bearing No. PB-10-EB-

3636 and other household articles.

Learned counsel for the complainant submits that Verna car and household articles which was taken into possession by the police along with 5 *tollas* of gold, have been received by the complainant. However, the dispute still pertains to 25 *tollas* of jewellery lying with petitioner-Jagrup Kaur but she has returned two sets of gold weighing 5 *tollas* and she retained remaining 20 *tollas* of gold jewellery

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that entire items of jewellery have been returned.

Learned State counsel submits that the complainant after compromise has also gone to Canada and there is no statement of complainant about the remaining jewellery and other articles. The matter is still under investigation and the challan has not been presented so far.

Keeping in view the compromise between the parties and that the articles have been returned by the petitioner but the dispute of remaining gold jewellery still pending which will be seen by the Investigating Officer, this petition is allowed and the order dated 19.04.2017 is made absolute till the presentation of challan, subject to the following terms:-

- (i) that the petitioner shall make herself available for interrogation by the police as and when required;
- (ii) that the petitioner shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the accusation against her so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;
- (iii) that the petitioner shall not leave India without the prior permission of the Court.
- (iv) that the petitioner will seek regular bail on the

presentation of challan in Court, which the trial Court will decide on the basis of evidence collected during investigation.

November 06, 2017
Jyoti-II

(SURINDER GUPTA)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned:</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether Reportable:</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>