

**In the High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana
At Chandigarh**

CRM-M-48377-2019 (O&M)
Date of Decision:-13.12.2019

Parvinder Kaur @ Parminder Kaur ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Vijay Rana, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Ruchika Sabherwal, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab,
assisted by ASI Jaswinder Singh.

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J.(Oral)

1. The petitioner has approached this Court seeking grant of regular bail in respect of a case registered vide FIR No.127 dated 27.8.2019 at Police Station Satnampura, Phagwara, District Kapurthala under Sections 363 and 366 of Indian Penal Code.
2. The FIR was lodged at the instance of Kashmir Kaur, wherein it has been alleged that on 23.8.2019 when her niece Mandeep Kaur was going on a Rickshaw, then some lady called her from behind and upon which Mandeep Kaur came down from the Rickshaw and told the Rickshaw Puller that the said lady is her sister-in-law and that she has to go with her. It is alleged that since Mandeep Kaur did not return back they started looking for her and later upon watching CCTV footage installed in some of the shops, they came to

know that Mandeep Kaur was seen going along with petitioner Parvinder Kaur @ Parminder Kaur, Panch. It is further the case of prosecution that Mandeep Kaur was recovered on 28.8.2019 and her statement in terms of Section 164 Cr.P.C. was recorded wherein she categorically stated that she had accompanied Parvinder Kaur @ Parminder Kaur to Ludhiana from where she was taken to some place in Haryana by another lady, who was known to Parvinder Kaur @ Parminder Kaur and where she was threatened. She further stated that on the next day she was left back at Ludhiana.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case on account of political rivalry in the village as the petitioner happens to be Panch of the village Panchayat. The learned counsel for the petitioner has further submitted that, in any case, the investigation is complete and the petitioner is not required to be detained any further.
4. Opposing the petition, the learned State counsel has submitted that since specific allegations have been levelled in the FIR, which have been reiterated by the victim when her statement under Section 164 Cr.P.C. was recorded, no case for grant of bail is made out. It has, however, been informed that challan already stands presented and that charges are yet to be framed.
5. Having considered rival submissions addressed before this Court and while bearing in mind that the petitioner is a lady, who has been behind bars since the last more than three months and that challan already stands presented, further detention of the petitioner will not serve any useful purpose as the conclusion of trial is likely to take some time. The petition, as such, is

accepted and it is ordered that the petitioner be released on bail subject to her furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned.

13.12.2019

pankaj

(Gurvinder Singh Gill)
Judge

Whether speaking /reasoned	Yes / No
Whether Reportable	Yes / No