



**206 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH
CRM-M-2480-2024
Date of decision: 1st August, 2024**

Amanpreet Kaur

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Prince Goyal, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. A.S. Samra, AAG, Punjab.
Mr. Saurabh Verma, Advocate
for respondent No.2-complainant.

MANISHA BATRA, J (ORAL):-

Through the instant petition under Section 438 of Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, the petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case FIR No.258 dated 20.12.2023 registered under Section 306 of IPC, 1860 at Police Station Division No. 6, District Police Commissionerate, Ludhiana.

2. Vide order dated 18.01.2024 passed by this Court, the petitioner was released on interim bail and was directed to join investigation. On 18.01.2024, the following order was passed:-

“Petitioner-Amanpreet Kaur, who is widow of the deceased, seeks grant of anticipatory bail in respect of a case registered against her vide FIR No.258, dated 20.12.2023, Police Station Division No.6, District Police Commissionerate Ludhiana, under Section 306 IPC.

The FIR was lodged at the instance of Navjeet Kaur (mother of deceased Ramandeep) wherein it is alleged that marriage of his son Ramandeep (deceased) was



solemnized with petitioner-Amanpreet Kaur on 12.5.2021 and since the petitioner wanted to go abroad, the complainant's son spent an amount of Rs.14 lakhs from time to time in order to enable her to appear in IELTS, but she was unsuccessful. Subsequently, the matter was discussed in Panchayat and the petitioner had paid an amount of Rs.10 lakhs. However, subsequently, a dispute arose between the deceased and the petitioner and the petitioner is alleged to have left her matrimonial home. However, there was a settlement amongst the parties and a petition for divorce by way of mutual consent was filed. It is alleged that the petitioner however, used to maltreat the complainant's son and used to harass him and had been threatening him that in case he does not return back the amount she would ruin his life. It is alleged that on 18.9.2023 complainant's son had paid an amount of Rs.1.25 lakhs to the petitioner in the Court and that another amount of Rs.1.25 lakhs was to be given on the next date of hearing. It is alleged that the petitioner however, kept on harassing the deceased and ultimately the complainant's son being fed-up and harassed committed suicide.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that she has falsely been implicated in the instant case and that although there was matrimonial discord between the parties but with the intervention of the respectables it had been decided that the parties would get their marriage dissolved by mutual consent. Learned counsel in this regard has drawn the attention of this Court to statement of the deceased as well as of the petitioner recorded in the proceedings under Section 13-B of Hindu Marriage Act wherein both of them have admitted that a compromise had been effected as the parties were unable to reside together and that an amount of Rs.1.25 lakhs had already been paid and the remaining were to be paid on the second motion and it is specifically recorded that the parties would not initiate any civil or criminal



proceedings against each other.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that from the aforesaid statements it is it is apparent that it is simply a case of matrimonial discord and which has now been given the colour of a criminal case pursuant to commission of suicide by complainant’s son whereas there is nothing on record to suggest that it is the petitioner who had abetted the commission of suicide.

Notice of motion for 09.05.2024.

Meanwhile, in the event of arrest, the petitioner be released on interim bail subject to her furnishing personal bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of Arresting/Investigating Officer. However, the petitioner shall join the investigation as and when called upon to do so and cooperate with the Arresting/Investigating Officer and shall abide by the conditions as provided under Section 438 (2) Cr.P.C.”

- 3. Learned State counsel on instructions has submitted that the petitioner has joined the investigation on 12.02.2024 and he is not required for custodial interrogation.
- 4. In view of the said facts, without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the order dated 18.01.2024 granting interim bail to the petitioner is made absolute, subject to the conditions laid down in Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure.
- 5. Since the main petition has been allowed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

1st August, 2024
Parveen Sharma

- 1. *Whether speaking/ reasoned* : Yes / No
- 2. *Whether reportable* : Yes / No