

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

CRM-M-54646-2023
Date of Decision: 05.12.2023

...Petitioner

VS.

...Respondent

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. with a prayer to grant anticipatory bail to him in case FIR No.109 dated 06.07.2023, registered under Sections 420, 494, 379, 120-B of IPC, at Police Station Bhawanigarh, District Sangrur.

2. The FIR in the present case was got registered by Sonu Singh against Sinder Kaur alias Shinder Kaur, petitioner and Jasvir Kaur. As per the complainant, Sinder Kaur alias Shinder Kaur, petitioner and Jasvir Kaur had arranged the marriage of complainant with Simran Kaur by taking an amount of Rs.50,000/- from him. On 14.11.2022, the marriage ceremony was performed between the complainant and Simran Kaur and the entire expenses of the Hotel were borne by the complainant. After solemnization of the marriage, the complainant had given jewelry to Simran Kaur. After 2/3 days of the marriage, Simran Kaur went to her parental house and returned back after 20 days. After

her return, she stayed only for 10 days with the present complainant. At about 4.00 a.m. on 16.12.2022, Simran Kaur fled from home with some stranger and the complainant came to know about this incident from the CCTV footage. Simran Kaur, co-accused had taken away all the valuable articles, gold etc. from the house of the complainant. Later on, the complainant came to know that Simran Kaur was already married to Karan Gill.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely involved in the present case and had no connection with Simran Kaur. He further contends that false and baseless allegations have been levelled against the petitioner that she had taken a sum of Rs.50,000/- for solemnization of marriage of the complainant with Simran Kaur. He further contends that the Additional Sessions Judge, Sangrur had observed that seven other FIRs are pending against the co-accused, whereas, the petitioner had no concern with the allegations levelled by the complainants in those FIRs. Learned counsel further contends that in the present case, the main accused, namely Simran Kaur has already been granted the concession of bail and the custody of the petitioner will not serve any meaningful purpose.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that one more FIR has been registered against the present petitioner. However, the petitioner is on bail in the said case.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

6. In the present case, the only allegation against the petitioner and Jasvir Kaur is that they had received a sum of Rs.50,000/- for performing

marriage of Simran Kaur with the complainant. Even no recovery is to be effected from the present petitioner and Simran Kaur, main accused has already been granted the concession of regular bail.

7. Thus, without any further discussion, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is granted concession of anticipatory bail, subject to the conditions as provided under Section 438(2) of the Cr.P.C. It will be open for the Investigating Officer to call the petitioner to join investigation, if so required, by issuing a written notice in this regard and she shall abide by the conditions mentioned in Section 438(2) of the Cr.P.C.

05.12.2023
hemlata

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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