



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

205

CRM-M-6710-2024

Date of decision : 24.05.2024

Kirandeep Kaur and others**..... Petitioners****versus****State of Punjab****..... Respondents****CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN**

Present: Mr. Ashish Aggarwal, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

PANKAJ JAIN, J. (Oral)

1. While issuing notice of motion on 08.02.2024, following order was passed:-

“The petitioners, who are all ladies, seek grant of anticipatory bail in respect of a case registered vide FIR No.76, dated 12.5.2023 at Police Station Kamboj, District Amritsar Rural, under Sections 452, 355, 427, 323, 365, 511, 148 and 149 of Indian Penal Code.

The FIR was lodged at the instance of Prabhjot Kaur, wherein it has been alleged that her brother had solemnised marriage with one Manpreet Kaur daughter of Dilbagh Singh against the wishes of her family. It is alleged that after solemnizing marriage, the complainant's brother and Manpreet Kaur had also approached the High Court seeking protection and when the members of family of Manpreet Kaur came to know about the same, then the petitioners, who are from the family of Manpreet Kaur, entered

2024.PHHC:076696



into the house of complainant and when complainant's father opened the gate, the petitioners allegedly scuffled with complainant's father and also with complainant's mother and gave blows to them with their slippers. It is further alleged that the aforesaid persons also tried to forcibly take away the complainant by pulling her from her arms.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in the present case by the complainant simply in order to settle scores and to cause harassment to them being aggrieved by the fact that Manpreet Kaur, who is their relative, had solemnized marriage with complainant's brother against their wishes.

Notice of motion for 24.5.2024.

Meanwhile, in the event of arrest, the petitioners be released on interim bail subject to their furnishing personal bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of Arresting/Investigating Officer. However, the petitioners shall join the 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.”

2. Today, learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Sargun Singh, has stated that pursuant to the order dated 08.02.2024, the petitioners have joined investigation and are no longer required for custodial interrogation.

3. In view of above, the interim order dated 08.02.2024 passed by this Court is made absolute, subject to the conditions as enumerated under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

2024.PHHC:076696



4. This order should not be treated as "blanket" order. It will not be read granting petitioners indefinite protection from arrest. It shall be confined to the FIR mentioned *ibid* and will not operate in respect of any other incident that involves commission of an offence.
5. This order does not in any manner limit or restrict the rights or duties of the police or investigating agency, to investigate into the charges against the petitioners.
6. The petitioners shall be deemed to be in custody for the purpose of Section 27 of the Evidence Act, 1872 in regard to a discovery of facts made in pursuance of information supplied by the petitioners in case the occasion arises.
7. It will be open to the police or the investigating agency to move this court for a direction under Section 439 (2) Cr.P.C. to arrest the accused, in the event of violation of any term, such as absconding, non-cooperating during investigation, evasion, intimidation or inducement to witnesses with a view to influence outcome of the investigation or trial.
8. Needless to say that anything observed herein shall not be construed to be an opinion on the merits of the case.
9. Disposed off accordingly.

(PANKAJ JAIN)
JUDGE

24.05.2024

Dinesh

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes

Whether Reportable : No