

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

SANJIV KUMAR SHARMA
2015.01.17 14:01
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this document

CRM No. M-27633 of 2013 (O/M)
Date of decision : 15.1.2015

Jasbir Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. Veneet Sharma, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Nikhil K. Chopra, Deputy A.G. Punjab.

Mr. Upender Prasher, Advocate, for respondent No. 2.

1. Whether the Reporters of local newspaper may be allowed to see the judgment ?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not.
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest ?

-. -

-. -

KULDIP SINGH, J. (ORAL)

The compromise has not been effected between the parties.

It is alleged that the parties were married on 22.2.2009. At the time of marriage, 8 tolas of gold was given to the husband and father-in-law. One son was born to the parties on 11.1.2011. Then, there are allegations that the petitioner brought one lady Manpreet Kaur to his house and that the complainant was beaten up and that the demand of a car was made.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the petitioner was earlier married with Manpreet Kaur on 1.5.2006. No

child was born out of the said wedlock. The complainant is none else than the daughter of the *Massi* (sister of husband's mother) of the petitioner and that for procuring a child, the second marriage was performed on 22.2.2009. The complainant was fully aware about the first marriage of the petitioner. Even on the insistence of the complainant, the petitioner had divorced his first wife on 1.10.2013.

Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Rajinder Singh, states that the petitioner has joined the investigation and is no longer required for further investigation.

Learned counsel for the complainant has opposed the prayer for grant of bail on the ground that the petitioner, who is working in Shromani Gurdwara Parbandhak Committee at Amritsar, has not come to this Court with clean hands. He has transferred a plot in the name of his mother to avoid the liability of maintenance. It has been argued that the life of the complainant has been spoiled.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned Deputy Advocate General for the State, learned counsel for the complainant and have also carefully gone through the file.

The allegations and the counter allegations are yet to be examined during the trial. The petitioner has joined the investigation and has been thoroughly interrogated. If the allegations are proved on merit, the petitioner can be accordingly held guilty. However, there is no ground to keep him behind the bar. Accordingly, the

CRM No. M-27633 of 2013 (O/M)

SANJIV KUMAR SHARMA
2015.01.17 14:01
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this document

interim bail granted to the petitioner by this Court, vide order dated
2.9.2013, is made absolute.

Petition is accordingly allowed.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

15.1.2015
sjks