

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

**CRM-M-25810-2015**

**Date of decision: 10.12.2015**

**Satya Pal Sanduria and another**

**... Petitioners**

**Vs.**

**State of Haryana**

**... Respondent**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK**

Present: Mr. R.S. Pandher, Advocate  
for the petitioners.

Mr. Vikas Chopra, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Arvinder Arora, Advocate  
for the complainant.

\*\*\*\*\*

**RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK, J. (ORAL)**

Petitioners seek pre-arrest bail in FIR No.129 dated 13.06.2014 under Sections 406, 498-A and 34 IPC, registered at Police Station Naraingarh, District Ambala.

Notice of motion was issued and interim protection was granted. Therefore, parties were directed to appear before the Mediation and Conciliation Centre to explore the possibility of an amicable settlement. However, parties have failed to arrive at an amicable settlement.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that in compliance of the order passed by this Court, petitioners have joined the investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency. Whatever the dowry articles were in their possession, the same have been recovered. He prays for

allowing the present petition.

On the other hand, learned counsel for the State as well as learned counsel for the complainant submit that although petitioner has joined the investigation but they did not cooperate with the investigating agency. They further submit that dowry articles particularly the gold articles are yet to be recovered from the petitioners, for which their custodial interrogation would be required. They pray for dismissal of the present petition.

After hearing the learned counsel for the parties, going through the record of the case and giving thoughtful consideration to the contentions raised, this Court is of considered opinion that keeping in view the totality of facts and circumstances of the case, petitioners have been found entitled for the concession of anticipatory bail. It is so said because there is no allegation against the petitioners levelled by either learned counsel for the State or learned counsel for the complainant that they have tried to misuse the concession of interim anticipatory bail granted in their favour. Petitioners shall face the criminal trial. Admittedly, petitioners are parents-in-law of the complainant. It is also not in dispute that complainant as well as her husband had been staying in United States of America. Differences arose between the husband and wife and in such a situation, it shall be a debatable issue before the learned trial Court, as to whether petitioners, being parents-in-law, have, as a matter of fact, played any role in the commission of offences alleged against them.

In view of the above and without commenting anything further on merits at this stage, lest it should prejudice the case of either side, instant

petition is allowed and the order dated 06.08.2015 passed by this Court, is hereby made absolute, however, subject to the conditions envisaged under Section 438 (2) Cr.P.C.

Disposed of, accordingly.

**[ RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK ]**  
**JUDGE**

10.12.2015  
*vishnu*