

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

**CRM-M-6166 of 2015 (O&M)  
Date of Decision: 8.9.2015**

Dharminder Kumar Jindal

.....Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

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

Present : Mr. B.D.Sharma, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. K.D.Sachdeva, Additional A.G. Punjab.

Mr. Munish K. Chaudhary, Advocate  
for the complainant.

\*\*\*\*

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

**CRM-29021 of 2015**

Petitioner seeks permission to place on record Annexures P-5 to P-10 and also seeks exemption from filing certified copies of Annexures P-5 to P-7.

Application is allowed, as prayed for.

CRM stands disposed of.

**CRM-M-6166 of 2015**

Petitioner seeks pre-arrest bail in FIR No. 176 dated 9.12.2014 under Sections 406/498-A/506 IPC, registered at Police

Station City SBS Nagar.

Notice of motion was issued and interim protection was granted.

Learned counsel for the State, on instructions from ASI Mohinder Singh, submits that in compliance of the order passed by this Court, petitioner has joined the investigation but some dowry articles are yet to be recovered from him.

Learned counsel for the complainant vehemently opposes the present petition contending that petitioner did not get the dowry articles recovered. He prays for dismissal of the present petition.

Faced with the above, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance of the order passed by this Court, petitioner has joined and cooperated with the investigating agency. He further submits that petitioner is still ready to join and cooperate with the investigating agency. He also submits that petitioner is not running from law and his custodial interrogation is not required. He prays for allowing the present petition.

Having heard the learned counsel for the parties, after careful perusal of the record of the case and giving thoughtful consideration to the rival contentions raised, this Court is of the considered opinion that in the given fact situation of the present case, it being a matrimonial dispute, petitioner has been found entitled for the concession of anticipatory bail. It is so said, because in compliance of the order of this Court, petitioner has joined the investigation. There is no allegation that petitioner has misused the concession of interim anticipatory bail granted by this Court.

In view of the above and without commenting anything on the merits of the case, lest it should prejudice the rights of either of the parties, instant petition is allowed and order dated 25.2.2015 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**

8.9.2015  
*Ak Sharma*