

CRM-M No. 42056 of 2016 (O&M)

Date of decision : January 16, 2017

Ajay Rana and another

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab

....Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE LISA GILLPresent: Mr. Ashok Sharma Nabhewala, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Ms. Shivali, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Aditya Dassang, Advocate for
Mr. C.L. Verma, Advocate
for the complainant.

LISA GILL, J.

The petitioners pray for anticipatory bail in FIR No. 360 dated 05.11.2016 registered under Sections 304B, 34 IPC at Police Station Zirakpur.

Petitioner No. 1 is the brother-in-law (Jeth) of the deceased Reema Rana and petitioner No. 2 is the sister-in-law (Jethani) of the deceased. It is contended that matrimonial discord arose between the husband and wife and a complaint was submitted by the deceased. However, the matter was settled between the parties. The settlement was reduced into writing on 20.04.2016 (Annexure P-3). Another settlement was arrived at between the parties on 12.05.2016, pursuant to which, the deceased and her husband namely Rajnish Rana shifted to a separate residence. They were residing separately since six months from the incident in question. They

had nothing to do with the personal lives of the deceased and her husband. It is further submitted that pursuant to order dated 06.12.2016 passed by this Court, the petitioners have joined investigation. Their custodial interrogation is no longer required.

Learned counsel for the State, on instructions from ASI Narinder Kumar, Police Station Zirakpur, affirms that the petitioners have joined investigation. It is stated that no recoveries are to be effected from them.

Learned counsel for the complainant, however, opposes this petition on the ground that the petitioners were interfering in the marital life of the deceased and her husband, which led to the death of the deceased. However, it is not denied that general allegations have been levelled against the petitioners. It is also not denied that the petitioner were living separately from the deceased and her husband as noted above.

There are no allegations on behalf of the State that petitioners are likely to abscond or that they are likely to dissuade the witnesses from deposing true facts in the Court, if released on bail.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case but without expressing any opinion on the merits of the controversy, it is considered just and expedient to allow this petition. In view of above, order dated 06.12.2016 is made absolute.

January 16, 2017
rts

(Lisa Gill)
Judge

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