

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

CRM No.M-2020-2017 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 03.03.2017

Inderdeep Kaur & another

... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA.

Present:- Mr. IPS Kohli, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. P.S. Grewal, DAG, Punjab.

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA, J.

This order shall dispose of the instant petition filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. seeking concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioners in case FIR No.48, dated 06.04.2016, under Sections 420/465/467/468/471/120-B IPC, registered at Police Station Division No.1, Jalandhar.

Perusal of the FIR would reveal that the same was got registered at the instance of Jasmeet Kaur. Allegations were against her own husband, namely, Harnoor Singh and his friend, namely, Amandeep Singh. Allegations in a nutshell were that on account of a strained matrimonial relationship, one cheque from the joint bank account held by the husband and wife, has been misused and by forging the signatures of the complainant, such cheque has been deliberately presented and has been got dis-honoured. The names of the present petitioners do not even figure in the FIR and they happen to be the mother-in-law and father-in-law respectively of the complainant.

Counsel appearing for the petitioners would submit that proceedings under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act had been initiated at the hands of Amandeep Singh and who had subsequently taken a different stand and has asserted that the cheque in question was put in his

hands by the present petitioners.

It is argued that it is a case of false implication and a fallout of a broken marriage.

Harnoor Singh i.e. husband of the complainant and who was specifically named in the FIR has been granted concession of anticipatory bail by this Court in the light of order dated 19.10.2016 in CRM-M-31396-2016.

Learned State counsel, who is on instructions from ASI Avtar Singh would apprise the Court that in pursuance to the notice of motion order dated 24.01.2017 passed by this Court, the petitioners have already joined investigation.

In view of the peculiar facts and circumstances noticed herein above and coupled with the fact that the petitioners have since joined investigation, their custodial interrogation would not be warranted.

Petition is allowed. Order dated 24.01.2017 passed by this Court is made absolute.

Disposed of.

03.03.2017

harjeet

**(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE**

- | | | |
|-----|----------------------------|-----|
| i) | Whether speaking/reasoned? | Yes |
| ii) | Whether reportable? | No |