

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

CRM-M-21668-2020 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 13.8.2020

Raj ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Gurpreet Singh Sandhu, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. M.S.Nagra, AAG, Punjab.

*(the aforesaid presence is being recorded through video conferencing
since the proceedings are being conducted in Virtual Court)*

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J.

1. The petitioner seeks grant of anticipatory bail in a case registered against her vide FIR No.201 dated 28.11.2019 under Sections 307/380/342/436/120-B IPC at Police Station A-Division, District Amritsar.
2. The FIR was lodged at the instance of Jagdish Raj wherein he has stated that he has three children, two of whom are in Canada while his son Kunal Arora is working with him. It is stated that Raj (petitioner) had been residing in their house since the last 10-12 years and was fully conversant with their household. It is alleged that on 17.10.2019 when the complainant's wife left for Canada to meet her son, then the complainant and his son Kunal Arora were alone in the house apart from Raj. The complainant's son Kunal Arora had stored five litres of petrol in the house for meeting with some emergent situation, if his scooter or motorcycle runs out of petrol and which fact was

known to Raj. It is alleged that on 21.11.2019, the complainant's son went for work at about 9.25 PM, while he was lying in the room. It is alleged that during the said period Raj locked the door of complainant's room from outside and set the room on fire with the help of petrol lying in the house. However, the residents of the locality broke into the house and rescued the complainant and called the fire brigade to control the fire. Upon checking CCTV cameras, it was found that Raj had opened the main gate of the house and had kept some articles outside the house and thereafter, the petitioner Raj bolted the main gate from inside and scaled the wall and after picking up the articles placed by her, she left from that place. The complainant alleged that later upon checking, he found that an amount of ₹ 5 lacs was missing from the almirah of dressing room.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case and that there is no evidence worth credence to connect the petitioner with the alleged occurrence.
4. Opposing the petition, the learned State counsel has submitted that not only the petitioner is specifically named in the FIR but her involvement is clearly borne out from the CCTV footage collected from the cameras installed at the spot.
5. I have considered rival submissions addressed before this Court.
6. In view of the nature of allegations where an attempt was virtually made to kill the complainant and that the complicity of the petitioner is borne out from the CCTV footage, this Court does not find any special case for grant of anticipatory bail.

7. The petition is sans merits and is hereby dismissed.

13.8.2020
kamal

(Gurvinder Singh Gill)
Judge

Whether speaking /reasoned Yes / No

Whether Reportable Yes / No