

**IN THE COURT OF Dr. RANJAN KUMAR KHULLAR,
ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE, BATHINDA
(UID PB0215).**

CIS No: BA/1740/2024
Date of Order: 23.05.2024

Harjinder Kaur @ Golo Kaur daughter of Jaswant Singh, resident of Surjeet Nagar, Bhagta Bhaika, P.S. Dayalpura, district Bathinda.

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab.

Respondent.

FIR No.28 dated 10.05.2024
Under Sections 307, 323, 148, 149 IPC.
P.S. Dayalpura, district Bathinda.

Bail application u/s 438 Cr.P.C.

Present: Sh. Maninder Singh Sidhu, Advocate for the petitioner.
Ms. Veenu Ghai, Addl.PP for the State.
Sh. M.S. Sidhu, counsel for complainant.

ORDER

1. First Pre-arrest bail application of the petitioner under Section 438 Cr.PC in case FIR No.28 dated 10.05.2024 Under Sections-307, 323, 148, 149 IPC, P.S. Dayalpura, district Bathinda, is considered.

2. Summary of the case of the prosecution is that present case has been registered on the statement of Angrej Singh to the effect that on 06.05.2024, he along-with his cousin Jaspreet Singh was returning back to their house from the Power House, Village Bhagta Bhaika. At about 9.00 am, when they reached near the Karyana shop of Shamvir, then Jaspreet Singh alighted there. The complainant had to go on his motorcycle. At that time, Golo Kaur (petitioner) was standing there, who was to board the bus

for going to Spinning Mill, Jeeda. The complainant requested petitioner to give her side. On this, she started mis-behaving with the complainant as to why the complainant addressed her 'Madam'. She gave a slap to the complainant and the complainant pushed her aside. On this, Golo Kaur raised 'Raula'. Her father Jaswant Singh, brother Gori Singh and mother Paramjit Kaur came there along-with three unknown persons. Accused Jaswant Singh, who was armed with an iron rod, gave a blow on the head of the complainant with an intention to kill him. Then Jaswant Singh gave another blow, which hit on the left shoulder of the complainant. In the meantime, a number of persons gathered at the spot. The accused persons ran away from the spot.

3. Case of the petitioner is that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. As per the version of the FIR, the petitioner has not caused any injury to the complainant. The petitioner is ready to join the investigation. While on the other hand, learned APP for the State assisted by learned counsel for complainant have argued that the petitioner is not entitled to the concession of bail as the offence committed by the petitioner, is serious one.

4. I have considered the rival submissions and gone through the record.

5. In the present case, as per the version of the FIR, the petitioner was standing. She has not inflicted any injury to the complainant. Custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required. However, she is ready to join the investigation. In view of the factual facts and circumstances of the case, the petitioner is directed to be released on bail in the sum of Rs.50,000/- to

the satisfaction of IO. Accused–applicant is also directed to comply with the conditions, as enshrined under Section 438 (2) Cr.PC, as under:

1. Petitioner will make available herself for interrogation by the police officials as and when required;
 2. Petitioner shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement or threat to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade them from disclosing the facts to the Court or to any police officer;
 3. Petitioner shall not leave India without prior permission of the Court.
 4. Trial Court shall be liberty to cancel the bail order if the petitioner absents from the trial, subject to the exemption granted by the trial Court.
6. Copy of this Order be sent to the quarter concerned, for compliance. Bail application file be consigned to the record room.

Pronounced in the open Court.
Date of Order: 23.05.2024
Rajesh Kumar, Steno.Gr.II

(Dr. Ranjan Kumar Khullar,
Addl. Sessions Judge,
Bathinda/23.05.2024.
UID No.PB0215