

2024 : PHHC : 050968

212/2

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.7393 of 2024

Date of decision: 16th April, 2024

Anjana Shoor

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Arshit Goel, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Navdeep Singh, Dy. Advocate General, Punjab
for the respondent/State.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of bail under Section 438 Cr.P.C. in case FIR No.83 dated 28.08.2023 under Sections 380/454/427/201 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, registered at Police Station Division 5, District Commissionerate Jalandhar.

2. On 12.02.2024, while noticing the following submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner, this Court had granted the concession of interim bail to the petitioner and asked her to join investigation.

“Learned counsel for the petitioner, inter alia, contends that the petitioner, who is a lady, has been falsely implicated in the case in hand on the basis of some vague apprehension that she along with co-accused had broken the wall of the godown, trespassed into it and thereafter, committed theft of articles worth `15-20 lakh. Learned

counsel submits that the FIR is completely silent as to on which date the alleged theft took place much less it is not even the case of the complainant that there was any eyewitness to the crime in question. It has been submitted that identically placed co-accused have since been extended the concession of interim bail by this Court vide orders dated 06.11.2023 and 08.11.2023 (Annexures P-6 and P-7 respectively) passed by this Court.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance of the order dated 12.02.2024, the petitioner has joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency.

4. Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Ranjit Singh, 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 12.02.2024 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

April 16, 2024
rps

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