

209

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

CRM-M-10407 of 2019

Date of decision: September 25, 2019

Kiran Chaturvedi @ Kiran Upadhyay

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU

Present: Mr. Vishva Nath Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. V.G. Jauhar, Senior DAG Punjab.

Mr. P.S. Jammu, Advocate for the complainant.

MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU, J

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 petitioner, in FIR No.339 dated 29.11.2018, under Section 506 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (for short 'IPC') and Section 67 of the Information Technology (Amendment) Act, 2008, registered at Police Station Jodhewal, District Police Commissionerate Ludhiana.

On 06.05.2019, this Court has passed the following order:-

“Contends that the matter has been compromised between the parties and reference has been made to the order dated 02.05.2019 passed by this Court in CRM-M-19572 of 2019.

Adjourned to 23.07.2019.

In the meanwhile, the petitioner is directed to join 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.

To be heard along with CRM-M-19572 of 2019.”

Learned State counsel, on instructions from police official present in Court to assist him, has stated that in terms of order dated 06.05.2019, the petitioner has joined investigation and her custodial interrogation is not required.

In view of the above, order dated 06.05.2019 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

September 25, 2019

mahavir

Whether speaking/ reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No