

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

CRM-M No.29818 of 2023 (O&M)
Date of decision: 11th September, 2023

Shivani Devedi

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Vivek K. Thakur, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. I.P.S. Sabharwal, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab
for the respondent/State.
Mr. Krishan M. Vohra, Advocate for the complainant.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

CRM Nos.32696-97 of 2023

At the outset, learned counsel for the petitioner has made a
prayer for withdrawal of the instant applications at this stage.

Dismissed as withdrawn.

CRM-M No.29818 of 2023

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of bail under Section
438 Cr.P.C. in case FIR No.148 dated 17.03.2022 under Sections 307,
506, 34 of IPC, 1860 and Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959 registered at
Police Station Zirakpur, District SAS Nagar.

2. On 06.06.2023, while noticing the following submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner, a Coordinate Bench of this Court had granted the concession of interim bail to the petitioner and asked her to join investigation.

“Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the instant FIR is a counter blast to an FIR, which was lodged by the petitioner bearing No.189 dated 20.10.2021, under Sections 354-D, 379-A, 452, 506, 34 of IPC, registered at Police Station Kalka, District Panchkula (Annexure P-2), whereby firstly an FIR was registered by the complainant, in which the petitioner had joined the investigation, but nothing concrete has been concluded so far. Now the instant FIR has been narrated with such sequence of allegations merely with a view to make the offence look like with most gravity invoking Section 307 & 506 despite the fact that it is a no injury case. It is also apparent on behalf of the petitioner that three unknown persons alleged to have been fired shots, but hit no one.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance of the order dated 06.06.2023, the petitioner has joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency.

4. Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Nirmal Kaur, does not dispute the factum of the petitioner having joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency. He, on further instructions submits that the petitioner is not required for further investigation much less for her custodial interrogation.

5. In the circumstances, the petition is allowed and the interim order dated 06.06.2023 is made absolute subject to the conditions laid down in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C. Needless to say, in case the petitioner misuses the concession of bail granted to her, the State would be at liberty to seek cancellation of the bail granted to her.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

September 11, 2023
rps

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No