



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

210

CRM-M-20680-2024

Date of decision: 25.07.2024

Veenu

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL**

Present : Mr. Gurpreet Singh, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Navdeep Singh, DAG, Punjab.

\*\*\*\*

**MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)**

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of anticipatory bail under Section 438 of the Cr.P.C. in case FIR No.79 dated 31.03.2024 under Section 306 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, registered at Police Station Kharar.

2. On 26.04.2024, while noticing the following submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, a Coordinate Bench of this Court, had granted the concession of interim bail to the petitioner and asked her to join investigation:-

*“Counsel for the petitioner submits that in the instant case, deceased-Parminder Singh, son-in-law of the petitioner, committed suicide after 13 years of his marriage with the daughter of the petitioner namely Komal and they were having two children. Counsel for the petitioner further submits that Parminder Singh was drug addict and used to beat his wife Komal who left the matrimonial home on 2.3.2024 and the incident in question took place thereafter on 30.3.2024. It is further submitted that the petitioner or her daughter are not responsible for the death of Parminder Singh in any*



CRM-M-20680-2024

*manner and there was no intention on their part to drive the deceased to end his life by consuming Celphos tablets. It is further submitted that co-accused/Komal is already given concession of interim bail by this Court vide order dated 24.4.2024 passed in CRM-M-20282-2024. It is further submitted that the petitioner is having no criminal history and is ready to join investigation with the police.”*

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance of order dated 26.04.2024, the petitioner has joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency.

4. Learned State counsel, on instructions, 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 view of the above, the petition is allowed and interim order dated 26.04.2024, is made absolute subject to the conditions laid down in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

25.07.2024

Vinay

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)  
JUDGE

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