

206

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT  
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.19249 of 2021 (O&M)  
Decided on: 28.09.2021

Gurpreet Kaur and another

....Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab

....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN**

**Present :** Mr. Vinod Ghai, Sr. Advocate  
with Ms. Kanika Ahuja, Advocate  
for the petitioners.

Mr. Joginder Pal Ratra, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Deepak Aggarwal, Advocate  
for the complainant.

**ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J. (Oral)**

The petitioners pray for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR  
No.56 dated 03.04.2021, registered under Sections 306, 34 IPC at  
Police Station Civil Lines, Bathinda, District Bathinda.

The operative part of the order dated 18.05.2021, vide  
which interim anticipatory bail has been granted to the petitioners, is  
reproduced as under:-

*“...Counsel for the petitioners herein prays for  
grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners, while  
contending that the deceased and petitioner No.1 had  
solemnized a marriage, however, on account of various  
disputes between them, petitioner No.1 had left the  
matrimonial home and instituted a petition under Section  
125 Cr.P.C. for grant of maintenance to her and for the  
minor daughter as well. It is argued that as per the  
statement recorded of the deceased under Section 164*

CASE HEARD THROUGH VIDEO CONFERENCING

*Cr.P.C. on 26.03.2021, five days after he had consumed poison, it only mention that he had taken this extreme step due to mental tension at the hands of his wife, which would not constitute an act of instigation at the hands of petitioner No.1. In support of his arguments he would rely upon law settled by the Apex Court in 'Arnab Manoranjan Goswami vs. State of Maharashtra and others', 2020(13) Scale 311. It is contended that petitioner No.2 is the father-in-law of the deceased and they would join the investigation.*

*Notice of motion....”*

Counsel for the petitioners has submitted that, in pursuance to the order dated 18.05.2021, the petitioners have appeared before the Investigating Officer and have joined the investigation.

Counsel for the State assisted by counsel for the complainant and on instructions from SI Veerpal Kaur, has not disputed the aforesaid fact and submits that the petitioners are no more required for further investigation. Counsel for the State has further submitted that in fact, now the cancellation report has been approved by the Senior Superintendent of Police, Bathinda.

In view of the above, this petition is allowed and the interim bail granted to the petitioners vide order dated 18.05.2021 is made absolute subject to the conditions envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

(ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN)  
JUDGE

28.09.2021

yakub

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable:

Yes/No