

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

CRM-M-29031 of 2019.

Decided on:- July 11, 2019.

Palak Goyal.

.....Petitioner.

Versus

State of Haryana and another

.....Respondents.

CORAM: *HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARI PAL VERMA.*

Present:- Mr. Ashwani Gaur, Advocate
 for the petitioner.

HARI PAL VERMA, J. (Oral)

Prayer in this petition filed under Section 439(2) Cr.PC is for cancellation of anticipatory bail granted to respondent No.2 vide order dated 06.06.2019 (Annexure P-1) passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Kurukshetra in FIR No.40 dated 17.05.2019 under Sections 328, 376 and 506 read with Section 34 IPC (Sections 467 and 468 IPC have been added during investigation) registered at Women Police Station, Kurukshetra.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that while filing reply to the application filed by respondent No.2 seeking anticipatory bail, the police has submitted that during investigation, offence under Sections 467 and 468 IPC was added and further recovery of mobile phone, pistol and marriage certificate are to be effected from accused Siddarth Jain and, therefore,

interrogation is required. He further states that the documents including declaration (Annexure P-2) were got signed from the petitioner under the threat on gun point.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner.

This Court has perused the impugned order dated 06.06.2019 (Annexure P-1) passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Kurukshetra as well as declaration (Annexure P-3) allegedly signed by the petitioner. The argument that the petitioner has never signed the declaration (Annexure P-2) voluntarily and signed the same under the threat on gun point is a matter to be adjudicated during trial. Further, perusal of the FIR does reflect that the petitioner had been even staying with respondent No.2 as if she is a family member. Therefore, this Court finds no ground to cancel the anticipatory bail granted to respondent No.2 vide order dated 06.06.2019 (Annexure P-1) passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Kurukshetra.

The present petition is, accordingly, dismissed.

It is made clear that the observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case and the trial Court shall decide the same without being influenced with these observations in any manner.

July 11, 2019
Yag Dutt

(HARI PAL VERMA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes

Whether Reportable: No