

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

CRM-M No. 19194 of 2016 (O&M)

Date of decision: 25.07.2016

Gautam

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASPAL SINGH

Present : Mr. Gurinder Pal Singh, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Surender Singh, AAG, Haryana.

JASPAL SINGH, J. (Oral)

This is a petition preferred by the petitioner under Section 438 Cr.P.C. seeking pre-arrest bail in case FIR No. 106, dated 25.03.2016, under Sections 420, 406 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code read with Section 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961, registered at Police Station Pataudi, Gurugram, Haryana (Annexure P-6).

While issuing notice of motion, following order was passed by a coordinate Bench of this Court on 03.05.2016:-

"Prayer is for grant of anticipatory bail to accused petitioner Gautam in case FIR No.106 dated 25.3.2016 under Sections 420,406 read with Section 34 IPC read with Section 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act 28/1961 PS Pataudi, Gurgaon.

The petitioner accused is the bridegroom whose marriage was fixed for 6.2.2016 with Ms.Damini Yadav daughter of complainantKulbhushan Yadav. Unfortunately the marriage could not take place due to

allegations of demand of a Fortuner car from the bridegroom side and counter allegations regarding unwillingness of the bride.

It is contended that allegations apart the petitioner alongwith his family members are ready and willing for an amicable settlement in front of the biradari (brotherhood) and seek forgiveness.

Notice of motion for 8.7.2016.

At this stage Mr. Deependerr Singh, Advocate accepts notice on behalf of the complaint.

Till the next date, in the event of arrest, the petitioner shall be released on bail on furnishing adequate bail and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting/Investigating Officer. Petitioner shall appear before the I.O., as and when called upon for investigation and shall also be bound by all the conditions stipulated in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C. ."

On instructions from ASI Ashok Kumar, learned

State counsel has submitted that in compliance of order dated 30.05.2016, petitioners has joined the investigation and has already appeared before I.O./SHO for investigation.

Since the petitioner has already joined the investigation and have complied with the orders dated 30.05.2016 and is no more required for further investigation.

Taking into consideration the above facts of the case, interim order dated 30.05.2016 is made absolute, subject to the conditions, as envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

July 25, 2016

waseem

**(JASPAL SINGH)
JUDGE**

*Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable*

*Yes/No
Yes/No*