

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

**CRM-M No.7314 of 2017
Date of decision: 09.03.2017**

Ramanpreet Kaur and another

....Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE REKHA MITTAL

Present: Mr. G.S. Nahel, Advocate
for Mr. Navjot Singh, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Ankur Jain, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. K.S. Jatana, Advocate
for the complainant.

REKHA MITTAL J. (Oral)

The petitioners pray for grant of regular bail in FIR No.85 dated 14.08.2016 registered at Police Station Women, District Patiala, for offence punishable under Sections 376, 366(A), 366, 313, 354, 420, 323 and 120-B of the Indian Penal Code (in short 'IPC), 10 of the Child Marriage Act and 3/4 of the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act and 66-E of the Information Technology Act.

Counsel for the petitioners has submitted that as per the allegations raised by the complainant, she contracted marriage with Harneet Singh Ghuman on 29.07.2015 and thereafter she was maltreated and harassed by her husband, his parents and other relatives of her husband including the present petitioners for want of dowry, resulting in abortion. It is further submitted that marriage of the

petitioners namely sister and brother-in-law (Jija) of husband of the complainant was performed in the year 2012 and they are leading a happy married life in their separate house. It is further submitted that challan has been presented in the Court and conclusion of trial is likely to take its own time.

Counsel for the State has not disputed the factum of proceedings being pending before the trial Court but opposed the prayer for bail on the plea that offence under Section 313 IPC is serious in nature and the prosecutrix is yet to be examined.

Counsel for the complainant has submitted that dispute between the parties has been settled by way of compromise but the terms and conditions are yet to be reduced into writing.

I have heard counsel for the parties and perused the paperbook.

Concededly, challan has been presented in the Court and trial is pending. The petitioners are no longer required for the purpose of investigation. There are no allegations against the petitioners that they are likely to flee from the process of justice, if enlarged on bail.

Without commenting upon merits of the case, the petition is allowed and the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail on their furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court. However, they shall remain bound by the following conditions:-

- 1. They 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 them from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer; and*

2. *They shall not leave India without previous permission of the Court.*

(REKHA MITTAL)
JUDGE

09.03.2017
yakub

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