



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

209

CRM-M-27747-2024
Date of decision: September 25th, 2024

Inderjeet Kaur
.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab
.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Harmanjeet Singh Dhaliwal, Advocate
for Mr. Navraj Singh Mahal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Navdeep Singh, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

Mr. P.S. Chahal, Advocate
for Mr. Naveen Sharma, Advocate
for the complainant.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

Petitioner is seeking the concession of anticipatory bail under Section 438 of the Cr.P.C. in case FIR No.16 dated 16.04.2024 under Section 306 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, registered at Police Station Phool, District Bathinda.

2. Vide order dated 03.07.2024, the petitioner had been granted interim anticipatory bail with direction to join investigation and the relevant part of the said order reads as under:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner inter alia contends that she has been falsely implicated in the present case along with other coaccused for allegedly abetting the suicide of the father of the complainant. While drawing the attention of this court to FIR annexed as Annexure P1, learned counsel submits that her false implication in the case in hand finds credence from the fact that even as per the version put forward by the complainant, there was a compromise between



the parties which was reduced into writing on 15.05.2009 (Annexure P-2), as per which all the dowry articles were returned to the victim by her husband and by his family members. Learned counsel submits that the petitioner was in no manner connected with the matrimonial dispute interse between the daughter of the deceased and her husband. It has been submitted that there were matrimonial differences interse between the daughter of the deceased and son of the petitioner Harmeet Singh since 15.05.2009 and Sarabjit Kaur had been separately residing in her parental house along with her children. Learned counsel submits that hence, the petitioner could not have in any manner abetted the suicide of the deceased.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance of order dated 03.07.2024, 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 03.07.2024, is made absolute subject to the conditions laid down in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C./482(2) of BNNS, 2023.

September 25th, 2024
Puneet

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes

Whether reportable : No