

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

**CRM No.M-220 of 2018 (O&M)
Date of Decision: February 27, 2019**

Jasvir Kaur

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

Present: Mr.R.V.S.Chugh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

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

Mr.Gaurav Singla, Advocate
for the complainant.

INDERJIT SINGH, J.

Petitioner has filed this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.101 dated 06.12.2017 under Sections 420 and 120-B IPC, registered at Police Station Dharamgarh, District Sangrur.

Notice of motion was issued. Learned State counsel appeared and contested the petition.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned State counsel and have gone through the record.

As per prosecution version, money was paid to present petitioner, Kamaldeep Singh and Harjeet Singh etc. for sending daughter-in-

law of the complainant to America through Malaysia. As per the allegations, she was sent to Malaysia and then after spending money and expiry of period, she was brought back. In the FIR itself, it is stated that Satnam Singh, brother of accused Harjeet Singh returned the amount of ₹6,63,000/-. As per the allegations, still huge amount is to be recovered from Kamaldeep Singh and present petitioner.

Learned State counsel contended that as per allegations, currency of 750 Malaysian Ringgit is alleged to have been paid to the present petitioner. The petitioner has also brought demand drafts, which the complainant refused to take in the Court.

The petitioner has already joined the investigation. She is not required for custodial interrogation. The trial of the case will take long time. No useful purpose will be served by sending and keeping the petitioner in custody till the disposal of the case.

Otherwise also, keeping in view the facts and circumstance of the present case, allegations in the FIR and the fact that Harjeet Singh has now returned ₹13 lakhs out of the amount given by the complainant, without discussing the facts of the case in minute details and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, I find it a fit case, where the petitioner is entitled to benefit of anticipatory bail. Therefore, the present petition is accepted and the order dated 15.03.2018 granting interim bail to the petitioner, is made absolute

February 27, 2019
Vgulati

(INDERJIT SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes
No