

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

Crl. Misc. M-25248 of 2017 (O&M)
Date of Decision: February 15, 2018

Lovepreet Kaur

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JAISHREE THAKUR

Present:- Mr. K.S. Sidhu, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. A.S. Sandhu, Addl. AG Punjab.

Ms. Rashleen Virk, Advocate for
Mr. A.P.S. Shergill, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

JAISHREE THAKUR, J. (Oral)

This is a petition that has been filed under Section 439(2) Cr.P.C. for cancellation of bail, that was allowed by Addl. Sessions Judge, Bathinda by an order dated 02.06.2017 to respondent No.2 in FIR No.68 dated 22.04.2017, registered under Sections 498-A, 323, 506, 406 of Indian Penal Code, at Police Station Canal Colony Bathinda, District Bathinda.

Counsel for the petitioner contends that Annexure P-3, which is a bill dated 07.06.2016, has not been considered at the time of granting of bail. It is argued that the said bill would reflect that dowry articles i.e. washing machine, led tv, fridge, almirah etc. were bought and handed over

as dowry articles.

At this stage, learned counsel for the respondent-State submits that some gold articles and led tv have been recovered, while also submitting that charges have been framed and the accused is facing trial.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties.

In view of the fact that bail was granted to accused-respondent No.2 and he is facing trial, no ground is made out for cancellation of the said bail order, only on the ground that Annexure P-3 has not been taken into consideration.

The petition in hand is dismissed accordingly.

February 15, 2018
vijay saini

(JAISHREE THAKUR)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No