

207-2

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

CRM-M-6073 of 2019

Date of decision: May 09, 2019

Neeru Kumari

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU

Present: Mr. K.P.S. Dhillon, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Sandeep Kumar, DAG Punjab.

Mr. Salil Bali, Advocate for respondent No.2-complainant.

MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU, J (Oral)

Present petition has been filed under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (for short 'Cr. P.C.') for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.264 dated 19.12.2018, under Sections 420, 120-B of Indian Penal Code, 1860, registered at Police Station Mandi Gobindgarh, District Fatehgarh Sahib.

On 08.02.2019, while issuing notice of motion, this Court has passed the following order:-

“Contends that in CRM M-2885 of 2019, this Court has already issued notice of motion for 05.03.2019 and granted the interim protection to the husband of the petitioner.

Notice of motion for 05.03.2019.

To be heard along with CRM M-2885 of 2019.

In the meanwhile, the petitioner is directed to join the investigation before the Investigating Officer. In the event of her arrest, the Arresting Officer would admit her to interim bail till the next date of hearing on her furnishing adequate bail and surety bonds to his satisfaction. The petitioner is also

directed to abide by all the conditions as envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.”

Learned State counsel, on instructions from Assistant Sub Inspector Nazar Singh has submitted that the petitioner has joined investigation in terms of order dated 08.02.2019 and her custodial interrogation is not required.

In view of the above, order dated 08.02.2019 granting interim bail to the petitioner, is made absolute subject to the provisions of Section 438(2) Cr. P.C.

Petition stands disposed off, accordingly.

However, it is made clear that the petitioner shall fully co-operate with the Investigating Officer as and when called for further investigation.

The above observations may not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU)
JUDGE

May 09, 2019
mahavir

Whether speaking/ reasoned: **Yes**

Whether Reportable: **No**