

CRM-M-35328-2017

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

CRM-M-35328-2017

Date of Decision: 15.12.2017

Jaswinder Kaur

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

Present: Mr. Har Naresh Singh Gill, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ayush Sarna, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Loveneet Thakur, Advocate,
for the complainant.

INDERJIT SINGH, J.

Petitioner-Jaswinder Kaur has filed this petition under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (for brevity, 'Cr.P.C.') for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.192 dated 06.09.2017, registered at Police Station City Kharar, District S.A.S.Nagar, under Sections 306 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

Notice of motion was issued in this case. Learned State counsel has put in appearance on behalf of the respondent-State and complainant has also appeared through her counsel. They contested this petition.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties as well as learned State counsel and have gone through the record.

CRM-M-35328-2017

Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that husband of the complainant died on 11.07.2016, however, FIR has been registered on 06.09.2017 i.e. after a period of more than one year. He further argued that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. He further argued that the petitioner is not required for custodial interrogation.

On the other hand, learned counsel for the complainant argued that there are so many cases pending against the present petitioner and co-accused Harjit Singh. They have made a gang and even murder cases are pending against them. He further argued that there are other FIRs under Section 420 of IPC also. He also argued that the complainant has got registered the FIR after making representations to the police authority and also approaching this Court etc.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case; nature and gravity of the offence and in view of the facts that the petitioner is named in the FIR as well as in the suicide note also and there are serious allegations against her, I do not find it a fit case where the petitioner is entitled to the benefit of anticipatory bail.

Therefore, finding no merit in the present petition, the same is dismissed.

15.12.2017

parveen kumar

**(INDERJIT SINGH)
JUDGE**

Note:	Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes
	Whether reportable	:	No