

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

CRM M-37992 of 2017.

Date of Decision: 09.11.2017.

Kirandeep Kaur

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM : Hon'ble Mr. Justice Jitendra Chauhan

Present : Mr. S.S. Sidhu, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Gulnoor Ghuman, AAG Punjab
assisted by ASI Sapinder Singh.

Mr. T.S. Sidhu, Advocate,
for the complainant.

JITENDRA CHAUHAN.J.(ORAL)

The present petition has been filed under Section 438

Cr.P.C seeking anticipatory bail in case FIR No. 259 dated 21.09.2017

registered under Section 306 read with Section 34 IPC at Police Station

Nathana, District Bathinda.

On 10.10.2017 this Court had passed the following
order:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is the mother-in-law of deceased Amandeep Kaur. The death has taken place at the parental home. The deceased has not left any suicide note. The allegation that the deceased was not welcomed at the matrimonial home on account of giving birth to a female child is without any basis. The deceased, in fact, had voluntarily gone to her parental house and the son of the petitioner (co-accused) visited the in-laws on number of occasions.

Notice of motion for 09.11.2017.

Meanwhile, in the event of arrest of the petitioner by the Arresting

Officer, she shall be released on interim bail subject to the following conditions:-

1. That she shall make himself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;
2. That she shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer and;
3. That she shall not leave India without prior permission of the Court.

At this stage, Mr. T.S. Sidhu, Advocate, causes representation on behalf of the complainant.”

It is contended that in pursuance of the order dated 10.10.2017, the petitioner has joined the investigation.

Learned State counsel, on instructions, states that the petitioner has joined the investigation and she is not required for custodial interrogation.

Learned counsel for the complainant does not wish to oppose the bail application.

In view of above, the order dated 10.10.2017 passed by this Court is made absolute, subject to furnishing of bail-bonds/surety bonds by the petitioner to the satisfaction of the CJM/Duty Magistrate concerned.

The petition stands allowed.

09.11.2017.
SN

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

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