

IN THE PUNJAB & HARYANA HIGH COURT AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-38558-2016

Date of decision : 20.02.2017

Jasnoor Preet Kaur and another

... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present: Mr.Karanjit Singh, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr.Sharad Kumar Yadav, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Angel Sharma, Advocate
for the complainant.

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J.(ORAL)

Though learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners have joined investigation pursuant to the order dated 27.10.2016, learned counsel for the complainant submits that as a matter of fact the Ist petitioner committed a fraud with the complainants' son, by contracting a second marriage with him in November 2015, whereas she (petitioner no.1) had already solemnized a marriage earlier with one Jobanjeet Singh on 18.09.2014, registered at Amritsar on 25.08.2015.

However, thereafter, allegedly in connivance with a Clerk in the office of the Registrar of Marriages, the register showing such marriage was 'misplaced' and a certificate obtained that no such marriage was shown to have been registered on the said date between petitioner no.1 and

As regards the contention of learned counsel for the petitioners that she had in fact filed a complaint against the complainant and his family for harassment for dowry etc. on 13.08.2016, learned counsel for the complainant submits that as a matter of fact a complaint was also made with regard to the alleged theft of goods from the complainants' house on 13.08.2016, duly diarised, after which a preliminary inquiry was conducted.

Without making any comment upon the contents of the FIR as regards the theft, however, in view of the fact that petitioner no.1 is stated to have contracted a marriage earlier with somebody else, prior to her marriage with the complainants' son, I do not think this is an appropriate case where the concession of anticipatory bail should be continued in favour of petitioner no.1.

Consequently, without making any final comment in respect of any contention raised before this Court, this petition is dismissed qua petitioner no.1 and the interim order dated 27.10.2016, qua petitioner no.1, is vacated.

However, as regards petitioner no.2, she being the mother of petitioner no.1, I see no reason to deny her anticipatory bail. Consequently, the order by which interim bail was granted to petitioner no.2 on 27.10.2016 is made absolute, on the same terms and conditions.

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

February 20, 2017.

Davinder Kumar

Whether speaking / reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No