

CRM-M-10119-2021

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

CRM-M-10119-2021

Date of decision: 04.03.2021

Charanjeet Kaur

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Deepak Aggarwal, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

Case is taken up for hearing through video conferencing.

Through this petition, the petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No.66 dated 08.06.2019, registered under Sections 313, 315, 323 and 34 IPC, at Police Station Nehianwala, District Bathinda.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the present dispute has arisen out of a matrimonial dispute in the family. The complainant is the daughter-in-law of the petitioner. Now, the matter has been compromised between the parties and the complainant has sworn an affidavit dated 03.09.2020 (Annexure P-2), deposing therein that she had no objection, if the anticipatory bail is granted to the petitioner. Moreover, co-accused, namely, Baggad Singh, husband of the petitioner, has since been granted the benefit of anticipatory bail, vide order dated 18.09.2020 passed by this Court in CRM-M-28575-2020.

Notice of motion.

CRM-M-10119-2021

On the asking of this Court, Mr. Saurav Khurana, DAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State.

Heard.

The compromise has already been effected between the parties. The co-accused has since been granted the benefit of anticipatory bail. Therefore, this Court finds that the petitioner is not required for any custodial interrogation and no useful purpose would be served by sending her behind the bars.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, this Court finds merit in this petition and the same is allowed. The petitioner is directed to join the investigation as and when called upon to do so and if she is sought to be arrested, she shall be released on anticipatory bail to the satisfaction of Investigating Officer/Arresting Officer, subject to the conditions as envisaged in Section 438 (2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

It is made clear that if pursuant to and in compliance with this order, the petitioner does not cooperate with the investigating agency, the investigating agency would be at liberty to move an appropriate application for cancellation of bail.

04.03.2021

parveen kumar

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No