

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

CRM No. M-45739 of 2016.

Date of Decision: 16.02.2017.

Inderjeet Kaur

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM : Hon'ble Mr. Justice Jitendra Chauhan

Present : Mr. Deepak Sharma, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Saurabh Mohunta, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Sandeep Gahlawat, Advocate,
for the complainant.

JITENDRA CHAUHAN.J.(ORAL)

The present petition has been filed under Section 438
the Cr.P.C seeking anticipatory bail in case FIR No. 279 dated
25.11.2016 registered under Sections 365, 406, 420 and 120-B IPC at
Police Station Parao, District Ambala.

On 22.12.2016 this Court had passed the following
order:-

“CRM-40767-2016

Application is allowed as prayed for.

Sections 406, 420 and 120-B IPC are allowed to be added in the
head note as well as in the prayer clause.

Registry is directed to amend the petition accordingly.

CRM-M-45739-2016

Learned counsel refers to Annexure P-2 to contend that the

deponent has filed affidavit that she has no objection if her husband, Gurjit Singh takes the children along with him to Italy. The petitioner being sister-in-law of the complainant has nothing to do with the matrimonial affairs of the complainant and the co-accused, Gurjit Singh.

Notice of motion.

At the asking of the Court, Mr. Saurabh Mohunta, DAG, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State. A complete copy of the paper book has been furnished to the learned State counsel, in the Court.

At this stage, Mr. Sandeep Gahlawat, Advocate causes representation on behalf of complainant.

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 herself 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.

Post again on 16.02.2017.”

It is contended that in pursuance of the order dated 22.12.2016, 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.

In view of above, the order dated 22.12.2016 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.

16.02.2017.
SN

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

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