

**117+205 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

**CRM-14994-2021 in/and
CRM-M-18138-2021
Date of Decision: 28.06.2021**

Parvesh Kaur

.....Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present: Mr. Prateek Pandit, Advocate,
for the applicant-petitioner.

Mr. Sidakmeet Sandhu, A.A.G, Punjab.

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J. (ORAL)

Case heard via video conferencing.

CRM-14994-2021

By this application, the applicant-petitioner seeks to place on record what is shown to be a 'disclosure statement' of the co-accused of the applicant, i.e. of her son Pushpinder Singh.

Notice in the application.

On the asking of the court, Mr. Sidakmeet Sandhu, A.A.G, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State.

A copy of the application be emailed to learned State counsel by counsel for the petitioner today itself.

Without making any comment on the actual merits of the case, the application is allowed subject to all just exceptions and the aforesaid statement is ordered to be taken on record as Annexure P-9 with the accompanying petition.

CRM-M-18138-2021

This petition has been filed under the provisions of Section 439 Cr.P.C., for grant of 'regular bail' to the petitioner in case FIR No. 104, dated 07.09.2020, registered at Police Station Begowal, District Kapurthala, for the alleged commission of offences punishable under the provisions of Sections 302/34 of the IPC.

Learned counsel for the petitioner points to the medical prescriptions and bills annexed as Annexure P-2 (collectively) with the petition, to submit that the deceased (daughter-in-law of the petitioner) was taking tablet Levenue-1000 right since 2015, as per her medical prescription, on account of epileptic fits that she was suffering from and that one of the side effects of the long use of that medicine can also be a tendency to commit suicide.

He further submits that the allegation in the FIR was that actually the petitioners' son, i.e. the husband of the deceased, strangled her whereas the case of the accused is that she actually committed suicide by hanging herself with a '*dupatta*'.

He next submits that the petitioner is a 74 year old lady who has been in custody since 11.09.2020, i.e. about 09½ months, with the trial not having progressed so far as no prosecution witnesses having been examined though the charge has been framed.

Learned State counsel, on the other hand, submits that the petitioner as also her co-accused, i.e. her husband and son, were all found to have committed the murder of the deceased as per the investigation and consequently she does not deserve to be admitted to bail. However, as per his instructions, the petitioner is actually a 74 year old lady.

That being so, without making any comment on the actual merits of the case, the petition is allowed. The petitioner shall be admitted to bail upon her furnishing adequate bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

June 28, 2021
nitin

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes
No.