

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

Crl. Misc. No. M-42752 of 2015

DATE OF DECISION: 10.05.2016

Rajesh Chaudhary and another

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

BEFORE:- HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE DAYA CHAUDHARY

1. **Whether reporters of local newspaper may be allowed to see judgment? (Yes/No)**
2. **To be referred to reporters or not? (Yes/No)**
3. **Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest? (Yes/No)**

Present:- Mr. Narender Hooda, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Sudhir Hooda, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Ms. Trishanjali Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Surinder Gaur, Advocate
for the complainant.

DAYA CHAUDHARY, J.

Learned senior counsel for the petitioners contends that in compliance of order passed by this Court on 18.12.2015, the petitioners have joined the investigation and recovery has also been effected from them.

Learned counsel for the respondent-State on instructions from HC Sunny has also affirmed the factum of joining the investigation by the petitioners as well as of effecting recovery from them.

Learned counsel for the complainant opposes grant of bail to the petitioners on the ground that all dowry articles have not been

recovered from the petitioners.

Admittedly, the allegations in the FIR are matter of evidence and the same can be tested during trial. Nothing can be said at this stage whether all the allegations are correct or not. Since the petitioners have joined the investigation and recovery has also been effected from them, interim order passed by this Court on 18.12.2015 is made absolute.

Petition stands disposed of accordingly.

May 10, 2016
pooja

(DAYA CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE