



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH**

276

**CRM-M-35160-2017(O&M)  
Date of Decision: 01.04.2025**

RUPINDER KAUR

..... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANR

..... Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA**

Present Mr. Dilpreet Singh Gandhi, Advocate  
for the petitioner/complainant.

Mr. Adesh Pal Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Karan Bhardwaj, Advocate  
for respondent No. 2/accused.

\*\*\*\*

**ANOOP CHITKARA, J. (ORAL)**

Seeking initiation of criminal proceeding under Section 340 read with Section 195 CrPC against respondent No.2, the complainant has come up before this Court on the ground that to secure bail respondent No. 2 had filed a forged wedding card before this Court and even respondent No.2 never disputed the stand of petitioner.

2. Counsel for respondent No.2 submits that respondent No.2 who is aged about 74 years filed petition for bail based on forged wedding card in the year 2016 wherein he was granted interim protection, however, the same was disposed of on 18.09.2017 and referred to relevant portion of said order, which reads as under:-

*“However, it is not in dispute that the petitioner had obtained ad-interim bail on the strength of forged wedding card. Thus he has played with the process of the Court. I do not think that the court should tolerate the insertion of a document, as contended. In that view of the matter, the petitioner is not entitled to the grant of anticipatory bail. The petitioner is directed to surrender before the court which shall decide his application within three days of his surrender.*

*Disposed of.”*

3. Counsel for respondent No.2 further submits that the allegations of forging have already been taken note of by the co-ordinate Bench, as such, this petition is not



maintainable; moreover, it is a matter of evidence, whether the wedding card was forged one or not.

4. Since, the co-ordinate Bench has already dismissed the bail petition which ultimately led respondent No.2 to surrender, as such, in the given position, this Court does not deem it appropriate to launch prosecution against respondent No. 2 in the larger interest of justice, equity and fair play.

5. Given above, the present petition stands dismissed. All pending miscellaneous applications, if any, stand disposed of.

**(ANOOP CHITKARA)**  
**JUDGE**

**01.04.2025**

*Jyoti-II*

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether Reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>