

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

CRM-M No.15272 of 2017
Date of decision: 30th August, 2017

Kuldeep Kaur

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE FATEH DEEP SINGH

Present: Mr. Amit Bansal, Advocate for
Mr. Sumeet Puri, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Sandeep Kumar, Dy. Advocate General, Punjab
for the respondent/State.

FATEH DEEP SINGH, J.

Petitioner Kuldeep Kaur has moved this application under Section 439 Cr.P.C. seeking regular bail in case bearing FIR No.15 dated 01.02.2016 under Sections 302/201/34/120-B IPC pertaining to Police Station Amargarh, District Sangrur.

The brief allegations of the prosecution are that initially a DDR was got registered by petitioner Kuldeep Kaur, who happens to be the wife of Karamjit Singh (now deceased), stating that her husband has died due to a road-side accident as his motorcycle had slipped, but subsequently during the course of investigations, father of the deceased Jarnail Singh suspecting foul play, made a statement that the petitioner wife was having illicit relations with one Halim Khan @ Jaggu and as a

consequence of which the duo had hatched a conspiracy in connivance with non-applicant Mohd. Alam @ Talu and murdered the deceased.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has based primarily his arguments on the grounds that some of the witnesses of the prosecution have not supported the story of the prosecution and there is no eye-witness account to the same nor the petitioner could be reasonably connected with the commission of crime and that she is behind bars since a long time and the trial is not likely to conclude in near future.

Learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the relief being sought by the petitioner on the grounds that the petitioner has already influenced the witnesses as is evident from their resiling at the trial and if allowed bail she would influence the remaining witnesses with more rigor and that it is a case based on circumstantial evidence and has sought dismissal of the same.

Appreciating the arguments put forth by the two sides, the story of the prosecution bears out how the petitioner wife who was cheating upon the deceased husband had managed to remove him who was apparently a stumbling block in her way to the enjoyment of her amorous relationship. Mere period of incarceration is no extenuating circumstance. Keeping in view the seriousness of allegations and

heinousness of the offence disentitles the petitioner to any relief. Thus, finding no merit the present petition stands dismissed.

Records be sent back immediately.

(FATEH DEEP SINGH)
JUDGE

August 30, 2017
rps

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No