

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

Date of Decision: January 08, 2018
CRM-M No.31863 of 2017

Baljinder Kaur @ Nachhattar Kaur

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CRM-M No.32417 of 2017

Gurmeet Kaur

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE LISA GILL

Present: Mr. Bhupinder Ghai, Advocate for
Mr. G. S. Brar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Monika Jalota, DAG, Punjab
for the respondent-State.

Mr. Mansur Ali, Advocate
for the complainant.

LISA GILL J. (ORAL)

This order shall decide *CRM-M No.31863 of 2017* titled as
Baljinder Kaur @ Nachhattar Kaur vs. State of Punjab and *CRM-M*
No.32417 of 2017 titled as *Gurpreet Kaur vs. State of Punjab*.

The petitioners in both the said petitions seek the concession
of bail pending trial in FIR No.227 dated 11.08.2017, registered under
Sections 306, 34 IPC, at Police Station Samrala, District Ludhiana.

Contentions on behalf of the petitioners recorded on

27.10.2017 by this Court, read as under:-

“The petitioners – Gurmeet Kaur and Baljinder Kaur are the mother and grandmother of the co-accused Gurwinder Singh @ Toti. They are residents of the same village as that of the deceased though Gurwinder Singh @ Toti is mentioned to be living in America for two years prior to the incident in question. The said Gurwinder Singh is alleged to have brought to dis-repute the deceased and he was instrumental in the break up of marriage and consequential divorce of the deceased.

Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) submits that as far the present petitioners are concerned, it is alleged that they asked their son to demand ₹5 lakhs from the deceased. Ingredients of Section 306 IPC, it is contended, are not made out. The petitioner – Baljinder Kaur is stated to be 76 years old. Both the petitioners, it is stated, are ready and willing to face proceedings.”

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that pursuant to the above said order dated 27.10.2017, the petitioners have joined investigation. They undertake to face the proceedings and not abuse the concession of anticipatory bail, if confirmed. The petitioners are not involved in any other case. Therefore, these petitions be allowed.

Learned counsel for the complainant has opposed this bail application while submitting that it is the harassment at the hands of the present petitioners and the co-accused that his daughter committed suicide.

Learned counsel for the respondent-State on instructions from ASI Jarnail Singh, verifies that the petitioners have joined investigation and their custodial interrogation is not required. The petitioners are not reported to be involved in any other criminal case. There is no allegations that the petitioners are likely to abscond or that they are likely to dissuade

the witnesses from deposing true facts before the learned trial Court, if released on bail.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case but without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, it is considered just and expedient to allow these petitions. Consequently, order dated 27.10.2017 is made absolute.

(LISA GILL)
JUDGE

January 08, 2018

rittu

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