

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

CRM-M-22341-2019

Date of decision:10.09.2019

RAVINDERPAL SINGH AND OTHERS

....Petitioners

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present: Mr. Vipin Mahajan, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Kirat Singh Sidhu, DAG, Punjab.

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioners seek grant of anticipatory bail in respect of FIR No.24 dated 25.10.2016 under Sections 307, 306, 302, 34 IPC, Police Station Kotli Surat Malhi, Batala District Gurdaspur wherein they have been ordered to be summoned to face trial along with co-accused with the aid of Section 319 Cr.P.C.
2. The FIR in the present case was lodged at the instance of Tarlok Singh, father of deceased Kulbir Kaur, wherein it has been alleged that his daughter was married to Jatinder Pal on 4.2.2005, however, she used to be harassed by her in-laws for having brought less dowry. It is further alleged that subsequently the accused forcibly administered Celphos tablets to his daughter in an attempt to kill her.
3. It is further the case of the prosecution that Kulbir Kaur, however, could

not survive and consequently offence under Sections 306 IPC was added. Upon investigation of the matter, challan was filed only against Balkar Singh father-in-law of Kulbir Kaur in respect of offence punishable under Section 306 IPC.

4. The petitioner No.1-Ravinderpal Singh is '*Dewar*' (brother-in-law) of the deceased, petitioner No.2-Manraj Kaur is '*Devrani*' (sister-in-law) of deceased and petitioner No.3-Baljit Kaur is mother-in-law of the deceased.
5. Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that the petitioners have falsely been implicated in the present case and have now been summoned with the aid of Sections 319 Cr.P.C. on the basis of improvements made in the statements of the prosecution witnesses. It has further been submitted that the petitioners, in any case, have already furnished interim bail bonds and are appearing regularly before the trial Court.
6. Opposing the petition, learned State counsel has submitted that since the petitioners were residing in the same household, therefore, their complicity is evident especially since the petitioners are specifically named in the FIR also. It has however been informed that petitioners have already appeared before the trial Court wherein amended charges have already been framed after summoning the petitioners.
7. Having considered rival submissions addressed before this Court and bearing in mind that the petitioners have been summoned with the aid of Section 319 Cr.P.C. and that after appearance of petitioner before Trial Court, amended charges have already been framed, detention of the

petitioners at this stage would not be justified. The petition is accepted and the interim directions issued vide dated 16.05.2019 by this Court are hereby made absolute subject to the condition that the petitioners would appear before trial Court regularly and shall also abide by the conditions as provided under Section 438 (2) Cr.P.C.

8. It is, however, clarified that none of the observations made above shall be construed to be an expression on merits of the main case.

(GURVINDER SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

10.09.2019
Gaurav Sorot

Whether reasoned / speaking?	Yes / No
Whether reportable?	Yes / No