

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-36462-2017

Date of Decision: 08.08.2018

Ranjit Kaur

...Petitioner

vs.

State of Punjab

..Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

Present: Mr. V.K.Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Joginder Pal Ratra, DAG, Punjab.

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN,J

On 28.09.2017, the following order was passed by this Court:-

“This is an application under Section 438 Cr. P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 14 dated 21.7.2017, under Section 409 IPC, registered at P.S. NRI, Jalandhar, District Jalandhar.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the complainant-Amandeep Kaur in this case is the adopted daughter of the petitioner and the petitioner through out her life was taking care of her upbringing and got her married. The present FIR is registered after the death of the husband of the petitioner.

It is further submitted that petitioner is an old kidney patient aged about 54 years and on account of some illegal demand made by the investigating officer, she has already filed CRM-M-34102-2017, Ranjit Kaur vs. State of Punjab, in which notice of motion has been issued for 26.10.2017.

It is further submitted that a bare perusal of the FIR shows that no offence is made out against the present petitioner as no date and time has been mentioned with regard to commission of any offence and the petitioner had joined the

investigation in pursuance to the interim bail granted by the Additional Sessions Judge, Jalandhar. However, same was declined with the observation that the petitioner is not co-operating.

Notice of motion for 26.10.2017.

In the meantime, arrest of the petitioner shall remain stayed subject to the conditions mentioned below, as envisaged in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C :-

- 1. She shall make herself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;*
- 2. She shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer; and*
- 3. She shall not leave India without previous permission of the Court.”*

Thereafter, the petitioner was again directed to join investigation on the request made by the Investigating Officer.

Counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is an old lady; suffering from multiple health problem and re-joined the investigation.

Learned State counsel, on instructions from Inspector Arvinder Singh and ASI Tarsem Chand, has submitted that the petitioner has joined the investigation and is not required for further investigation.

In view of the above, order dated 28.09.2017 is made absolute.

Disposed of.

08.08.2018
smriti

(ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN)
JUDGE

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