

[219] IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-44588-2023
Date of Decision : 20.01.2024

Sangeeta ...Petitioner
versus
State of HaryanaRespondent

Coram : HON’BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK GUPTA
Present : Mr. Sanjiv Kumra Aggarwal, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Amit Rana, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

DEEPAK GUPTA, J. (ORAL)

[1] On 06.09.2023, the following order was passed by this Court:-

“ Present: Mr. Sanjiv Kumar Aggarwal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Prayer in this petition is for grant of anticipatory bail under Section 438 Cr.P.C in case FIR No.588 dated 03.11.2015 registered under Sections 420, 467, 120-B of the IPC (Sections 468, 471 of the IPC added later on) registered at Police Station Civil Lines Rohtak, District Rohtak.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that husband of the petitioner namely Satish Balyan was found murdered on 07.06.2009 regarding which FIR No.328 of 2009 was registered at Police Station Jahangir Puri, Delhi. Deceased husband of the petitioner had executed Will dated 27.03.2009 during his life time. After coming to know of the said Will, it is the petitioner, who had filed a petition seeking probate of the Will. Though that probate petition was dismissed on 15.03.2017 but attention is drawn by learned counsel towards para No.10 of judgment dated 15.03.2017 passed by learned Civil Judge (Senior Division), Rohtak in the probate proceedings, wherein on one hand it was observed that signature on the Will of the testator were not matching, whereas on the other hand it was mentioned that Will cannot be compared because of the usage of over ink.

Learned counsel contends that though the Will in question was executed on 27.03.2009 and probate proceedings were initiated by the petitioner in 2011 but present FIR has been lodged by father of the

deceased Satish Balyan i.e. father-in-law of the petitioner, in 2015 with the allegation that she forged the signature of her husband and the thumb impression of the witnesses, after the death of the son of the complainant i.e. husband of the petitioner.

Notice of motion.

Mr. Randhir Singh, Addl. AG, Haryana accepts notice on behalf of respondent-State.

Adjourned to 23.11.2023 for filing status report by respondent-State.

In the meantime, in case of arrest, the petitioner shall be released on interim bail subject to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer/Investigating Officer. However, it is directed that the petitioner shall join the investigation as and when so required by the Investigating Officer. She shall not contact any person associated with the case to dissuade him from the investigation in any manner whatsoever and nor shall leave the country without prior permission of the Court. She shall further comply with the conditions stipulated in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C. ”

[2] Today, learned State Counsel, has informed this Court that the petitioner has joined the investigation, in compliance of the order dated 06.09.2023 and is no longer required for further investigation.

[3] In view of the aforesaid, the order dated 06.09.2023, whereby the petitioner was granted interim anticipatory bail, is hereby made absolute. However, she shall continue to join investigation, if and so required by the Investigating Officer.

[4] Disposed of.

(DEEPAK GUPTA)
JUDGE

20.01.2024
'Rajneesh'

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