

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

Sr. No.202

**CRM-M No.1905 of 2017
Date of decision: 12.05.2017**

Ravinder Kaur

....Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK SIBAL

Present: Mr. Pratham Sethi, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Yadav, DAG, Haryana.

* * *

DEEPAK SIBAL, J. (Oral)

Through the present petition filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C., the petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in FIR No.226 dated 09.11.2016, registered under Sections 406/420 IPC, at Police Station Shahkot, District Jalandhar.

As per the case of the prosecution, in the year 2014, one Nirmal Singh had talked with Raghbir Singh that he alongwith Balwinder Singh could arrange for permanent settlement of Raghbir Singh in Germany but for that Raghbir Singh would have to pay ₹20 lakhs. Nirmal Singh asked the complainant-Hardev Singh, who was Raghbir Singh's father, to speak to the petitioner, who is wife of Balwinder Singh and pay half the amount to her. The remaining half of the amount was to be paid to Balvir Singh father of Nirmal Singh. Raghbir Singh hand over his passport to Balwinder Singh and in January 2015, the complainant-Hardev Singh alongwith one Jaspal

lakhs to his father Balvir Singh. ₹8 lakhs were also handed over by the complainant to the petitioner in the presence of one Sukhdev Singh. The remaining amount of ₹4 lakhs was agreed to be given when Raghbir Singh would get permanently settled in Germany. Raghbir Singh was not got permanently settled in Germany. The aforesaid amounts as also the passport were also not returned.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner was falsely implicated in the case but irrespective of that fact the matter has now been compromised between the complainant and the petitioner. A copy of the compromise deed arrived at between the parties had been filed in Court today, which is ordered to be taken on record as Mark 'A'.

Learned State counsel on instructions from SI Bhupinder Singh, admits to the fact that the matter between the petitioner and the complainant has been compromised. It is further submitted on behalf of the State that the petitioner, at this stage, is not needed for custodial interrogation.

After considering the above submissions, it is directed that in event of arrest of the petitioner in FIR No.226 dated 09.11.2016, registered under Sections 406/420 IPC, at Police Station Shahkot, District Jalandhar, the petitioner be released on ad-interim anticipatory bail subject to the conditions as prescribed under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

Nothing observed herein above shall be considered to be an expression of opinion by this Court on the merits of the case.

If the petitioner is found indulging in any criminal act or misusing the concession of bail granted by this Court, it would be open to

the State to seek cancellation of bail granted through this order by filing an appropriate application before the competent Court/this Court.

(DEEPAK SIBAL)
JUDGE

May 12, 2017
Jyoti 1

<i>(i) Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>(ii) Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>