

CRM-M-11483-2015

[1]

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

CRM-M-11483-2015

Date of decision: 14.09.2015

Lavkesh Sharma and others

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and another

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SABINA

Present: Mr. L.M. Gulati, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Mr. J.S. Sekhon, AAG Punjab.

Ms. Gaganjot Kaur, Advocate,
for the complainant.

SABINA, J

Petitioners have filed this petition under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 seeking anticipatory bail in FIR No.21 dated 05.03.2015, under Sections 406 and 498-A of Indian Penal Code, 1860, registered at Police Station Women, Police Station Amritsar, District Amritsar.

While issuing notice of motion, following order was passed by this Court on 09.04.2015:-

“ Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that petitioners are parents-in-law of complainant/respondent No.2 and have nothing to do with the matrimonial life of their son. Complainant remained in India only for 15 days

CRM-M-11483-2015

[2]

after the marriage and thereafter, she went to Dubai. Son of the petitioners also went to Dubai. There are allegations from both sides. By referring to earlier complaint sent by father of the complainant through E.mail, learned counsel states that the allegations, forming subject matter of FIR against petitioners, are the result of afterthought.

Notice of motion for 7.7.2015.

Meanwhile, in the event of arrest, petitioners shall be admitted to interim bail, subject to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer. However, petitioners shall abide by the conditions incorporated under Section 438(2)Cr.P.C.

Learned State counsel who is assisted by Assistant Sub Inspector Gurdev Singh has submitted that the petitioners have joined investigation but recovery of the gold ornaments is yet to be effected.

During the course of argument, it has transpired that son of the petitioners was arrested and was released on regular bail.

Keeping in view the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner at the time of issuance of notice of motion and the fact that the husband of the complainant was arrested and released on regular bail, it would be just and expedient to confirm the interim bail granted to the petitioners.

Accordingly, interim bail granted to the petitioner by

CRM-M-11483-2015

[3]

this Court vide order dated 09.04.2015, is made absolute.

Petition stands disposed of accordingly.

September 14, 2015
kapil

(SABINA)
JUDGE