

**Veerpal Kaur and Others Vs. State of Punjab**

**Veerpal Kaur and Others Vs. State of Punjab**

**SooperKanoon Citation :** [sooperkanoon.com/1069455](http://sooperkanoon.com/1069455)

**Court :** Punjab and Haryana

**Decided On :** May-17-2013

**Appellant :** Veerpal Kaur and Others

**Respondent :** State of Punjab

**Judgement :**

CRM not M-12140 o

1. IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH Crl.

Misc.

not M- 12140 of 2013(O&M) Date of Decision: May 17, 2013.

Veerpal Kaur and others .....PETITIONER(s) Versus State of Punjab  
.....RESPONDENT (s) CORAM:- HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE RAM CHAND GUPTA  
Present: Mr.Inderjeet Sharma, Advocate, for the petitioners.Mr.P.S.Paul, DAG,  
Punjab.

\*\*\*\*\* RAM CHAND GUPTA, J.(Oral) The present petition has been filed for anticipatory bail under Section 438 of Code of Criminal Procedure in FIR no.29 dated 19.03.2013, under Sections 452/365/342/148/149 IPC, registered at police station Gidderbaha, District Sr.Muktsar Sahib.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the whole record including the impugned order passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sr.Muktsar Sahib dismissing anticipatory bail application filed on behalf of the petitioners.CRM not M-12140 o

2. This Court while issuing notice of motion on 12.04.2013 passed the following order:- Crl.M.No.21563 of 2013 Application is allowed subject to all just exceptions.

Crl.M.not M-12140 of 2013 Contends that daughter of petitioner no.3 was kidnapped by son of complainant and the said fact was admitted by complainant in complaint, Annexure P2, given by her to SHO, Police Station Giddarbaha.

It is further submitted that it was also stated in the said application that she had disowned her son as earlier as well he had kidnapped some other girl and not he had kidnapped daughter of petitioner no.3.

Further submitted that daughter of petitioner no.3 has not been recovered so far and, however, in order to pressurize the petitioners the present false complaint has been lodged by complainant on the plea that she was kidnapped by the present petitioners and later on released.

Notice of motion to Advocate General, Punjab, for 17.5.2013.

However, in the meantime, petitioners are directed to join the investigation and in case they are arrested, they shall be released on interim bail by the Arresting Officer to his satisfaction subject to compliance of conditions specified under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

It has been contended by learned counsel for the petitioners that they have already joined the investigation pursuant to said order dated 12.04.2013.

It has also been stated by learned counsel for the State, on instruction from HC Gursewak Singh, that petitioners have joined the CRM not M-12140 o

3. investigation and that they are no more required for any custodial interrogation.

Bail application is not opposed.

However, bail application has been opposed by learned counsel for complainant.

There are no allegations on behalf of the State that petitioners are likely to abscond or that they are likely to dissuade the witnesses from deposing true facts in the Court, if released on bail.

Hence, in view of these facts and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the anticipatory bail application filed on behalf of Veerpal Kaur, Gejo Kaur, Raj Kaur and Beant Kaur is accepted and order dated 12.04.2013 granting interim bail in favour of the petitioners is, hereby, made absolute subject to compliance of conditions specified under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C. The present petition stands disposed of accordingly.

( RAM CHAND GUPTA ) May 17, 2013.

JUDGE om

**SooperKanoon - India's Premier Online Legal Search - [sooperkanoon.com](http://sooperkanoon.com)**