

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

CRM-M-27221-2019

Date of decision:26.8.2019

SANGEETA RANI

....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present: Mr. H.P.S. Bhinder, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Kirat Singh Sidhu, DAG, Punjab
assisted by ASI Narinder Pal.

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner seeks grant of anticipatory bail in respect of FIR No.75 dated 5.5.2019 under Sections 376, 313, 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, Police Station City Hoshiarpur, District Hoshiarpur.
2. The FIR was registered at the instance of Kamaljit Kaur aged about 27 years wherein it has been alleged that she was earlier married to Surinder Saini and a girl had been born out of the wedlock but subsequently on account of matrimonial discord their marriage was dissolved. It is alleged that in the year 2017 the complainant became friendly with Varun Verma and developed physical relations with him with her consent. It is further alleged that later when she became pregnant, Varun Verma started quarreling with her and stated that they should not have a child. It is alleged that on 14.4.2019 mother of Varun Verma i.e. the present

petitioner called the complainant to her home and asked her to part ways with her son. However, the complainant told her that she is not feeling well and is having low blood pressure and Varun's mother i.e. present petitioner gave medicine to her. Complainant alleged that on the same evening later in the day, she started bleeding and on account of which the pregnancy was aborted.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that she has falsely been implicated in the present case and that in any case even as per the FIR the only role attributed to her that she had given some medicine to the complainant as a result of which her pregnancy was terminated whereas in fact there is no medical evidence to suggest that complainant was ever pregnant. It is further submitted that complainant is matured lady and voluntarily established physical relations with petitioner's son and is now trying to pressurize petitioner's son to marry her and due to which present FIR has been lodged.
4. Opposing the petition, learned State counsel has submitted that since the petitioner is specifically named in the FIR, no case for granting anticipatory bail is made out. It is however informed that during investigation, no such evidence could be collected suggesting that complainant was pregnant. It has also been informed that the petitioner has since joined investigation.
5. Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case and the nature of allegations levelled against the petitioner, in my opinion, it is not a case warranting custodial interrogation. Accordingly the petition is accepted

and the interim directions issued vide dated 24.6.2019 by this Court are hereby made absolute subject to the condition that the petitioner would appear before Investigating Officer as and when called upon to do so and cooperate with the Investigating Officer and shall also abide by the conditions as provided under Section 438 (2) Cr.P.C.

26.8.2019
Gaurav Sorot

(GURVINDER SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

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