

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

**201**

**CRM-M-12019-2020 (O&M)  
Date of decision: 21.07.2020**

Gurpreet Kaur @ Simran

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR TYAGI**

Present : Mr. Ritesh Panday, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. A.A. Pathak, Addl. A.G. Punjab  
for the respondent-State.

\*\*\*\*\*

**ARUN KUMAR TYAGI, J (ORAL)**

The case has been taken up for hearing through video conferencing.

**CRM-15964-2020**

Prayer in the application filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (for short, "Cr.P.C") is for placing on record a copy of statement dated 23.10.2019 of co-accused Sachin Sharma as Annexure R-1.

For the reasons mentioned in the application, the same is allowed and statement dated 23.10.2019 of co-accused Sachin Sharma is taken on record as Annexure R-1.

**CRM-M-12019-2020**

The petitioner has filed this petition under Section 438 of the Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.49 dated 02.03.2020 registered under Sections 420 and 120 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and Section 13 of the Punjab Travels Professionals (Regulation) Act, 2014 at Police Station Dina Nagar, District Gurdaspur.

While issuing notice of motion on 07.05.2020, Coordinate Bench of this Court had granted the interim anticipatory bail to the petitioner with direction to join the investigation.

Learned State Counsel has appeared on behalf of the respondent-State and opposed the bail application.

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

Learned Counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner was falsely implicated in the present case. The petitioner was merely an employee of co-accused Sachin Sharma. She never induced the complainant to pay the amount and no money was ever entrusted to her. The petitioner has joined the investigation and her custodial interrogation is not required for making any recovery.

Learned State Counsel, on instructions from S.I. Manjeet Singh, has acknowledged that in compliance with order dated 07.05.2020 passed by this Court, the petitioner has joined the investigation and submitted that her custodial interrogation is not required for effecting any recovery.

In view of the facts and circumstances of the case, particularly the fact that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required in the case but without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, I am of the considered view that the petitioner deserves the concession of anticipatory bail.

Therefore, the petition is allowed and order dated 07.05.2020 granting interim bail to the petitioner is made absolute. However, the petitioner shall join the investigation again if and as and when called upon to do so and shall abide by the conditions enumerated in Section 438 (2) of the Cr.P.C., failing which the protection of anticipatory bail order shall not be available to her.

**21.07.2020**

Kothiyal

**(ARUN KUMAR TYAGI)  
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No