

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

Sr. No.204

CRM-M No.9399 of 2017
Date of decision: 19.05.2017

Ranvir Kaur

....Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK SIBAL

Present: Mr. Divyadeep Walia, Advocate
for the petitioner.
Mr. Rupam Aggarwal, DAG, Punjab.

* * *

DEEPAK SIBAL, J. (Oral)

Through the present petition filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C., the petitioner seeks the concession of anticipatory bail in FIR No.07 dated 14.02.2017, registered under Sections 341, 323, 379-B, 148, 149, 120-B IPC, at Police Station Jaurkian, District Mansa.

On 20.03.2017, while issuing notice of motion, this Court had granted ad-interim anticipatory bail to the petitioner subject to the satisfaction of the Arresting officer.

As per the case of the prosecution, on 13.02.2017, the complainant alongwith his brother-in-law Sukhmander Singh executed a registered sale deed in favour of Sukhwinder Singh. Thereafter, the petitioner, who is the wife of Sukhwinder Singh is alleged to have made a phone call to some persons on the basis of which the complainant and Sukhmander Singh were given beatings by those persons. The petitioner is alleged to have got the complainant and Sukhmander Singh beaten up as she was apprehensive that they want to grab her property.

Seeking anticipatory bail for the petitioner, learned counsel

submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case because

of some property dispute amongst the family members; there is no other criminal case in which she is involved; she is a young lady aged 28 years; the complainant and Sukhmander Singh have received only simple injuries; no recovery is to be effected from her and that under the interim orders of this Court, the petitioner has not only joined investigation, she has fully cooperated with the investigating agency.

Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Jagsir Singh, admits to the fact that the petitioner has joined investigation; has fully cooperated with the investigating agency; is not needed for further questioning; there is no other criminal case in which the petitioner is involved and that the complainant is related to the petitioner.

Since the petitioner is a young lady of 28 years of age; she is not involved in any other criminal case; she has joined investigation; has fully cooperated with the investigating agency; whether she has been falsely implicated due to a property dispute amongst the family members, would be deciphered during the course of the trial and the complainant and Sukhmander Singh have been inflicted simple injuries, I am of the opinion that the present petition deserves to be allowed.

Resultantly, the order dated 20.03.2017 granting ad-interim anticipatory bail to the petitioner is made absolute subject to the condition prescribed under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

Nothing observed herein above shall be considered to be an expression of opinion by this court on the merits of the case.

If during the pendency of the present petition, the petitioner is found indulging in any other criminal activity/misusing the concession of bail, it will be open to the State to move an appropriate application before the competent Court/this Court for cancellation of the granted bail to the petitioner through this order.

(DEEPAK SIBAL)
JUDGE

May 22, 2017
Jyoti 1

<i>(i) Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>(ii) Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>