

**In The High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana
At Chandigarh**

CRM-M-44075-2020 (O&M)

Date of Decision:- 7.4.2021

Sheelo Bibi

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Tarun Sharma, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Harsimar Singh Sitta, AAG, Punjab.

(Proceedings conducted through video conferencing)

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner seeks grant of anticipatory bail in respect of a case registered vide FIR No.145, dated 23.7.2020, Police Station Guru Harsahai, District Ferozepur, under Sections 498-A and 406 IPC.
2. The FIR in hand was lodged at the instance of Parkash Kaur wherein she alleged that her marriage was solemnized with Kulwant Singh on 13.3.2019 and several articles were given in dowry including gold ornaments but her in-laws were not happy with the same and started

raising more demands. It is alleged that her in-laws in order to press upon their demands also gave beatings to her on several occasions.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has falsely been implicated merely on account of the fact that she happens to be mother-in-law of the complainant and that the FIR came to be lodged as there was some kind of matrimonial discord amongst the complainant and her husband.
4. Opposing the petition, learned State counsel has submitted that since the petitioner is specifically named in the FIR and specific allegations have been levelled against the petitioner, no case for grant of bail is made out. Learned State counsel has however, informed that the petitioner has since joined investigation and that the investigation is almost complete and the investigating agency is in the process of presenting a final report.
5. I have considered rival submissions addressed before this Court.
6. Having regard to the nature of allegations which apparently seem to have arisen on account of some kind of matrimonial discord amongst the complainant and her husband and while noticing that the petitioner who is aged about 62 years has already joined investigation, her custodial interrogation is not warranted. The petition, as such, is accepted and the interim directions issued by this Court vide order dated 28.12.2020 are hereby made absolute subject to the condition that the petitioner shall join investigation as and when called upon to do so and cooperate with the Investigating

Officer and shall also abide by the conditions as provided under
Section 438 (2) Cr.P.C.

7.4.2021
mohan

(GURVINDER SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking /reasoned	Yes / No
Whether Reportable	Yes / No