

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

Crl. Misc. No. M-6907 of 2024
Date of Decision: March 13, 2024

Rajdeep Kaur

.....Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present : Mr. P.S. Miglani, Advocate for
Mr. Param Preet Singh Brar, Advocate
for the petitioner

Mr. Sandeep Kumar, DAG Punjab

Mr. Arunjeet Singh Kakkar, Advocate
for respondent No. 2 – complainant

Harpreet Singh Brar, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in the petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.0005 dated 16.01.2024 registered under Sections 120-B, 419, 420, 465, 467, 468, 471 IPC at Police Station Sadiq, District Faridkot.

2. On 09.02.2024, the following order was passed :-

“The present petition has been filed under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure (hereinafter referred to as Cr.P.C) for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.0005 dated 16.01.2024 registered under Sections 120-B, 419, 420, 465, 467, 468, 471 IPC at Police Station Sadiq, District Faridkot.

Learned counsel for the petitioner, inter alia, contends that the petitioner is a household lady and she is a bona fide purchaser

of the land in question after paying the sale consideration. Fraud, if any, has been committed by the co-accused. Even the petitioner is the victim of said fraud and therefore, prays for concession of anticipatory bail.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. Subhash Godara, Addl. A.G., Punjab, who is present in Court, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State and opposes the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

At this stage, Mr. Arjunjeet Singh Kakkar, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of the respondent No.2-complainant and files his power of attorney, which is taken on record. He vehemently opposes the prayer made by the petitioner for grant of anticipatory bail on the ground that the allegations levelled against her are serious in nature.

*In the meantime, keeping in view the law enunciated by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Satender Kumar Antil Vs. CBI (2022) 10 SCC 51; Arnesh Kumar Vs. State of Bihar (2014) 8 SCC 273 and Mohd. Muslim alias Hussain Vs. State (NCT of Delhi) 2023 SCC OnLine SC 352**, at the first instance, the petitioner is directed to appear before the Investigating Officer on or before 16.02.2024 and on his doing so or in the event of arrest, the petitioner shall be admitted to interim bail on furnishing of bail/surety bond to the satisfaction of the Investigating/Arresting Officer. The petitioner shall cooperate with the Investigating Officer and abide by the conditions as provided under Section 438 (2) Cr.P.C.*

If the Investigating/Arresting Officer does not permit the petitioner to join the investigation, the petitioner would appear before the Illaqa Magistrate, who would then summon the Arresting Officer and direct him to join the petitioner in investigation, in terms of the order of this Court.

Adjourned to 13.03.2024.

Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed as expression of opinion of this Court on merits of the case and the trial Court shall proceed without being prejudiced by observations of this Court. ”

3. Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Jaideep Singh Raj, states that pursuant to order dated 09.02.2024, the petitioner has joined the investigation but she is not cooperating as she has not handed over her photograph for the purpose of record.

4. In view of the statement of learned State counsel, order dated 09.02.2024 is made absolute. The petitioner shall abide by the terms and conditions enumerated in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

5. Petition stands disposed of.

6. Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed as expression of opinion of this Court on merits of the case and trial court shall proceed without being prejudiced by observations of this Court.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

March 13, 2024

reena

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether Reportable : Yes/No