

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

**CRM-M-17177-2016
Date of decision-09.03.2017**

**Lakhwinder Kaur
Vs.
State of Punjab**

**...Petitioner

...Respondent**

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. Ashok Giri, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Harsimrat Rai, DAG, Punjab.

Ms. J.S.Rattu, Advocate for the complainant.

JITENDRA CHAUHAN, J. (Oral)

By filing the present petition under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, the petitioner has sought anticipatory bail in FIR No.28 dated 08.03.2016, registered under Sections 420 and 120-B of Indian Penal Code at Police Station Chamkaur Sahib, District Rupnagar.

On 18.05.2016 this Court had passed the following order:-

“The petitioner is sister-in-law of the complainant. The allegation against the petitioner is that she had sold the land of her son belonging to the co-owners, to Surmukh Singh for sum of Rs. 1.80 lacs. Notice to Advocate General, Punjab for 27.07.2016.

Meanwhile, an interim direction is issued that the petitioner will join investigation as and when required. In case of petitioner doing so, he will be released on interim bail to the satisfaction of the arresting officer.

Mr. Jasjit Singh Rattu, Advocate for the complainant has intervened to oppose application for pre-arrest bail.

It will be open to the counsel for the complainant to contest the application for bail by filing power of attorney on behalf of the complainant.”

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that the compromise has been reached between the parties. The petitioner has repeatedly joined the investigation.

The learned State counsel, submits that the petitioner has joined the investigation and she is not required for custodial interrogation.

In view of the above, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the interim bail granted by this Court vide order dated 18.05.2016, is made absolute, subject to furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate, concerned. However, at any stage, the factum of compromise is found to be against record, aggrieved party shall have the right to revive the present petition.

The petition stands allowed.

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

March 09, 2017
vanita

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