

210.

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

CRM-M-30914-2018

Date of decision:23.10.2018.

MANPREET KAUR

... Petitioner

versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARI PAL VERMA

Present: Mr. Sonpreet S. Brar, Advocate, for
Mr. J.S. Dhaliwal, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr.Rana Harjasdeep Singh, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Gurpal Singh Sandhu, Advocate,
for the complainant.

HARI PAL VERMA, J.(Oral)

Prayer in this petition filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.57 dated 12.05.2018 registered under Sections 420, 406, 120-B IPC at Police Station City Raikot, District Ludhiana (Rural).

On 24.07.2018, this Court has passed the following order:-

“Counsel for the petitioner states that the petitioner has been dragged in the case for the reason that she is wife of Pawandeep Singh Malli against whom there are allegations of taking away Rs.18 lakh so as to send the son of the complainant abroad. He has referred to the

partnership deed (Annexure P-3), wherein it is found that the petitioner is not the partner, though other co-accused are partners.

Notice of motion for 18.09.2018.

In the meantime, in the event of arrest of the petitioner, she shall be released on ad-interim bail to the satisfaction of the arresting officer. However, the petitioner shall join the investigation as and when directed by the investigating agency and shall abide by the terms and conditions laid down under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.”

Learned State counsel, on instructions from SI Jagroop Singh, states that no doubt the petitioner has joined investigation but on 11.01.2018, the complainant Ajit Singh has made a supplementary statement to the effect that an amount of Rs.2 lakhs was given to the petitioner when she was accompanying her husband and Labh Singh on 31.12.2015.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties.

Considering the fact that in the initial version which is the basis of registration of FIR, there is no such recital/statement as being made by the complainant on 11.01.2018 and noticing the fact that the petitioner has joined the investigation, this Court finds that the order dated 24.07.2018 whereby the petitioner was granted ad-interim bail, deserves to be made absolute.

In view of above, present petition is allowed and the order dated 24.07.2018 is made absolute.

However, if required, the petitioner shall continue to join investigation as and when required to do so and shall abide by the terms and conditions, as laid down under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

(HARI PAL VERMA)
JUDGE

23.10.2018
sanjeev

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No.
Whether Reportable:	Yes/No.