

316 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-46662-2022

Date of Decision: 13.12.2022

NIRMALA DEV

... PETITIONER

VS.

STATE OF PUNJAB

.. RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIVEK PURI

Present : Mr. Nimish Gautam, Advocate for
Mr. Dheeraj Mahajan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Iqbal Singh Mann, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. APS Rehan, Advocate
for the complainant.

VIVEK PURI, J.(ORAL)

On 11.10.2022, the following order was passed:-

“Petitioner is seeking anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No. 51 dated 24.09.2022 under Sections 498-A, 323, 34 IPC, registered at Police Station Purana Shalla, District Gurdaspur.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the marriage of the son of the petitioner was solemnized with the complainant on 01.08.2020. The allegations against the petitioner are to the effect that she had given slaps to the complainant and also raised the demand of car.

It has been submitted that the family of the petitioner was already having a Bolero vehicle even prior to the marriage of the complainant with her son. The petitioner is a widowed lady and having 3 sons. The other 2 daughters-in-law are having cordial relations with the petitioner and the present FIR is a result of temperamental differences between the son of the petitioner and the complainant.

Notice of motion.

Ms. Ruchika Sabherwal, DAG Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the State.

Adjourned to 13.12.2022.

Meanwhile, the petitioner shall join the investigation and would come present as and when called for and in the event of arrest, the petitioner shall be admitted to interim bail on her furnishing personal and surety bonds to the satisfaction of Arresting/Investigating Officer. The petitioner shall also abide by the conditions as specified under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.”

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that in pursuance of interim directions issued by this Court, the petitioner has joined the investigation.

Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Jagdeesh Singh, has not disputed the aforesaid factual aspect and further submits that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required.

Keeping in view the entire circumstances, sufficient grounds are made out to extend the concession of pre-arrest bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, order dated 11.10.2022, vide which the petitioner has been granted interim bail, is made absolute.

Petition is allowed.

13.12.2022
smriti

(VIVEK PURI)
JUDGE

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