

Sr.No.201

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

**CRM-M-13029 of 2020
Date of decision:12.02.2021**

Suman Adawal

... Petitioner(s)

versus

State of Punjab and another

... Respondent (s)

Coram: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Jasgurpreet Singh Puri

Present: Mr. Vikas Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. M.S.Nagra, Asst.AG, Punjab.

Through Video Conference

Jasgurpreet Singh Puri, J.(Oral)

Present petition has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.11, dated 26.02.2020 registered under Sections 420/120-B IPC and under Section 13 of Punjab Travel Professionals (Regulation) Act, 2014 at Police Station Rajasansi, District Amritsar.

It is a case of the petitioner that the petitioner was falsely implicated in the present case and that there was no specific allegation against the petitioner with regard to entrustment of the money for sending the complainant abroad. Learned counsel has further submitted that in fact the petitioner who is the wife of one Joypal Adawal and is not involved at all in the present controversy. He has further submitted that in view of the above, petitioner may be considered for the grant of anticipatory bail.

Notice of motion was issued in the present case on 28.05.2020 and the petitioner was directed to join the investigation within 07 days and

an interim protection was granted to the petitioner. On 13.08.2020 at the oral request made by learned counsel for the petitioner, the complainant was ordered to be impleaded as respondent No.2 and notice was issued to respondent No.2 for 10.11.2020. However, on 10.11.2020 the Registry had reported that notice could not be issued to respondent No.2 for want of process fee, therefore, fresh notice was issued for 24.11.2020. On 24.11.2020 Office had reported that respondent No.2 has been served but no one had put in appearance on behalf of respondent No.2. However, this Court adjourned the case in view of the fact that since the matter was being heard through video conferencing it would be just and proper to adjourn the case so as to enable respondent No.2 to appear, therefore, the case was adjourned for 08.12.2020. On 08.12.2020 the lawyers were abstaining from work and therefore, the matter was adjourned for 27.01.2021 and thereafter, it was again adjourned for today.

Till date, also nobody has put in appearance on behalf of respondent No.2.

Learned State counsel on instruction from ASI Lakhwinder Singh has stated that in pursuance of the order passed by this Court, the petitioner has already joined investigation and fully co-operating with the investigating officer.

In view of the above, but without commenting upon the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the order dated 28.05.2020, passed by this Court, is made absolute.

12th February, 2021

Shivani Kaushik

Whether speaking/reasoned

Whether Reportable

[JASGURPREET SINGH PURI]

JUDGE

Yes/No

Yes/No