



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

211

CRM-M-21416-2024
Date of decision: 25.07.2024

Asha KumariPetitioner

Versus

State of PunjabRespondent

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, District SAS Nagar.
2. On 30.04.2024, 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 present case deceased Parminder Singh committed suicide after 13 years of his marriage with co-acused Komal and they were having two children. Counsel for the petitioner further submits that there was marital discord between Parminder Singh and Komal and Komal left the matrimonial home dated 02.03.2024 whereas alleged occurrence took place on 13.03.2024. It is further submitted that Komal and her mother Veena are given interim relief by this Court vide orders dated 24.04.2024 and 26.04.2024 in CRM-M-20282-2024 and CRM-M-



CRM-M-21416-2024

20680-2024 respectively. It is further submitted that petitioner is distantly related to Komal and is not responsible for death of Parminder Singh who committed suicide by consuming poisonous pills. It is further submitted that there was no intention on the part of the petitioner to compel the deceased to end of his life by committing suicide. It is further submitted that 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 30.04.2024, 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 30.04.2024, is made absolute subject to the conditions laid down in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

25.07.2024

Vinay

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)

JUDGE