

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

113

CRM-M-21611 of 2020

Date of Decision: 05.08.2020

Manjit Kaur and another

.... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab

.... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUDIP AHLUWALIA

Present: Mr. Varun Sharma, Advocate for the petitioners.

SUDIP AHLUWALIA, J (ORAL)

The instant Petition has been filed under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure seeking Anticipatory Bail on behalf of the Petitioners in DDR No.45 dated 01.06.2020 in case FIR No.124 dated 01.06.2020, registered under Sections 323, 324, 341, 325, 506, 34 of the Indian Penal Code and later added Sections 326 and 201 of IPC, at Police Station City-1, District Sangrur.

2. Notice of motion.

3. Mr. Sidakmeet Sandhu, Asstt. Advocate General, Punjab to accept notice on behalf of the Respondent/State. A copy of the paper-book be handed over to him.

4. It transpires that initially the husband of petitioner No.1 had lodged FIR No.124 dated 01.06.2020 against the complainant in which the DDR case concerning the occurrence, which allegedly took place in the evening of 31.05.2020, was later on entered.

5. It may be mentioned that the dispute is actually between two

real brothers, namely, Balvir Singh (husband of petitioner No.1) and Davinder Singh, which started after the death of their father-Surjan Singh. They had mutually agreed that one brother would retain the house left by their father while the other would be entitled to compassionate Government job and other benefits accruing out of their father's service. However, after the file regarding job was cleared by the concerned Department in favour of the complainant Davinder Singh, he allegedly entered into the house of complainant and others and attacked the petitioner and others in an attempt to illegally and forcefully get executed affidavit to the effect that the house in question would also be given in totality to Davinder Singh.

6. It further transpires that the complainant and his wife-Harpreet Kaur, who are accused in original FIR No.124, have also been granted anticipatory bail by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sangrur on 22.07.2020.

7. Considering the close family relationship of the parties and the fact that the case involves a version and cross version, this Court is of the opinion that custodial interrogation of the petitioners in the present case is not called for. In view of aforesaid circumstances and the prayer of petitioners for Anticipatory Bail is, thus, allowed and they are ordered to be released on Anticipatory Bail subject to their furnishing Personal and Surety Bonds to the satisfaction of the Ld. Trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

8. Disposed off.

05.08.2020
D.Bansal

(SUDIP AHLUWALIA)
JUDGE