

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

1. Criminal Misc. No.M- 8600 of 2017(O&M)
Date of Decision: May 1 , 2017.

Dwarka Parsad PETITIONER(s)

Versus

State of Punjab RESPONDENT (s)

2. Criminal Misc. No. M- 8608 of 2017(O&M).

Uma Devi @ Saraswati Devi PETITIONER(s)

Versus

State of Punjab RESPONDENT (s)

CORAM:- HON'BLE MRS.JUSTICE LISA GILL

Present: Mr. Gursimran Singh Madaan, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Arshdeep S.Kler, DAG, Punjab.

1. Whether reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?
2. To be referred to the reporters or not?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest?

LISA GILL, J.

This order shall dispose of Crl.Misc. No.M-8600 of 2017 (Dwarka Parsad v. State of Punjab) and Crl.Misc. No.M-8608 of 2017 (Uma Devi @ Saraswati Devi v. State of Punjab).

Prayer in both these petitions is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners in FIR No.0033 dated 01.02.2017 under Section 306 IPC registered at Police Station Basti Bawa Khel, District Jalandhar. Petitioners are the parents-in-law of the deceased.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that they were living separately from the deceased and their son. There was matrimonial discord between their son and the deceased but the present petitioners had no role to play in the same. It is submitted that the deceased and her husband i.e. the son of the petitioners were living separately in a rented accommodation at New Shaheed Babu Labh Singh Nagar, Jalandhar. It is submitted that the averments in the FIR do not attract the rigors of Section 306 IPC. Furthermore, the petitioners have joined investigation pursuant to order dated 15.03.2017 passed by this Court. They are ready and willing to join investigation as and when required and face trial. They are not likely to abscond. The husband of the deceased is in custody. Therefore, these petitions be allowed.

Learned counsel for the State, on instructions from ASI Jasvir Singh, submits that the petitioners have indeed joined investigation and they are not required for custodial interrogation. No recovery is to be effected from them.

There are no allegations on behalf of the State that the 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 as above but without commenting upon or expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, both these petitions are allowed. Consequently, order dated 15.03.2017 passed in

both these petitions is made absolute.

It is clarified that none of the observations made hereinabove shall be construed to be a reflection on the merits of the case. The same are solely confined for the purpose of decision of the present petition.

May 1 , 2017.
'om'

(LISA GILL)
JUDGE

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