

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh

Crl. Misc. No. M-4546 of 2018

Date of Decision: 28.5.2018

Isha Khanna

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANITA CHAUDHRY

Present: Petitioner in person along with
 Mr. Rahul Bhargava, Advocate.

ANITA CHAUDHRY, J

The petition has been filed under Section 439(2) read with Section 482 Cr.P.C. seeking cancellation of anticipatory bail granted to respondents No. 2 and 3 in FIR No. 44 dated 26.11.2017, under Section 323, 354-A, 354-B, 34 IPC, registered at Police Station Airport, Amritsar.

The petitioner and her husband are present in the Court. Apparently there appears to be no dispute between them. The dispute appears to be with the in-laws.

Anticipatory bail had been allowed to respondents No. 2 and 3 by the Additional Sessions Judge, Amritsar in December 2017 but later a complaint was given to the SHO that they feared that their articles would be damaged when they are absent from the house or the lock of their room would be broken.

The petitioner had earlier approached this Court for directions to the police to safeguard their life and liberty at the hands of the in-laws and the said petition was disposed of on 23.10.2017 and the Commissioner

of Police, Amritsar had been directed to decide the representation and pass a speaking order.

The petitioner is seeking cancellation of anticipatory bail on the ground that the conditions under which anticipatory bail had been allowed, had been violated.

The counsel refers to condition No. 2 of the order and the argument is that they are being threatened and abused and the father-in-law refused to open the door and asked them to take back the FIR.

Admittedly, the petitioner is not living in that house now. They have already given a complaint to the police with respect to their articles. The house is owned by the father-in-law. The daughter-in-law had made accusation under Section 354-A and 354-B IPC. There is a dispute with respect to the property and the business which the petitioner's husband allegedly was running with the family. These issues are not to be gone into here. A complaint has already been given to the police. The correctness is to be ascertained whether such incident had occurred. No ground for cancellation of bail is made out.

The petition is dismissed in *limine*.

(ANITA CHAUDHRY)
JUDGE

May 28, 2018
Gurpreet

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes
Whether reportable	:	No