

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

CRM-M-No.31934 of 2018
Date of Decision:10.10.2018

Chandro Devi and anotherPetitioners
Vs.

State of Punjab and anotherRespondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR MITTAL

Present: Mr.Naveen Mandhan, Advocate for
Mr.Pankaj Bali, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr.K.S.Sidhu, DAG, Punjab.

Mr.Chirga Wadhwa, Advocate for respondent No.2.

SUDHIR MITTAL J. (ORAL)

The petitioners seek anticipatory bail in case FIR No.390 dated 21.07.2016, registered at Police Station Gharaunda, District Karnal, under Sections 406, 420, 467, 468, 471, 472, 506, 34 and 120-B IPC.

Learned State counsel submits that pursuant to order dated 30.07.2018, the petitioners have joined investigation and have been cooperating therewith.

Learned counsel for respondent No.2/complainant vehemently objects to the grant of anticipatory bail.

Learned State counsel submits that the petitioners have committed a serious offence and do not deserve the discretionary relief of anticipatory bail. He, however, does not dispute that the evidence in this case is entirely documentary in nature and the same is already available with the Investigating Agency.

In view of the above, the petition is allowed and the interim bail granted to the petitioners vide order dated 30.07.2018, is made absolute subject to compliance of conditions enshrined under Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, by them.

(SUDHIR MITTAL)
JUDGE

10.10.2018
Anjal

Whether speaking/reasoned?	Yes/No
Whether reportable?	Yes/No