

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

CRM No. M-18463 of 2017.

Date of Decision: 20.09.2017.

Karambir Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

... Respondents

CORAM : Hon'ble Mr. Justice Jitendra Chauhan

Present : Mr. Sant Lal Barwala, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Mahima Yashpal, AAG Haryana
assisted by ASI Ramesh Kumar.

Mr. Anil Malik, Advocate,
for the complainant.

JITENDRA CHAUHAN.J.(ORAL)

The present petition has been filed under Section 438
the Cr.P.C seeking bail in case FIR No. 263 dated 05.04.2017
registered under Sections 323, 498-A, 406 and 506 read with Section
34 IPC at Police Station Chandni Bagh Panipat.

On 11.08.2017 this Court had passed the following
order:-

“Learned counsel for the State, on instructions from ASI Bajinder Singh, submits that in pursuance of the registration of FIR bearing No.263 dated 5.4.2017 under Section 323/498-A/406/506/34 IPC at Police Station Chandni Bagh, Panipat, the complainant has made a statement before the police dated 08.04.2017 that she wants to recover the dowry articles through the process of the court.

In view of the said fact, I do not deem it appropriate to delve upon the merits and demerits of the case as the aforementioned allegation shall be subject to the outcome of the trial and proof of evidence brought on record.

It has also been brought to the notice of the court that marriage between the parties was solemnized on 30.01.2009 and a child out of the wedlock has also born. As the marriage was solemnized way back in the year 2009, I am of the view that it would be a matter of evidence before the trial Court.

Adjourned to 20.09.2017.

In the meanwhile, it is directed that the petitioner shall join the investigation as and when required and in the event of arrest of the petitioner, he shall be released on bail by the Investigation Officer on his furnishing bail bonds/sureties to his satisfaction, subject to the conditions mentioned under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.”

It is contended that in pursuance of the order dated 11.08.2017, the petitioner has joined the investigation.

Learned State counsel, on instructions, states that the petitioner has joined the investigation and he is not required for custodial interrogation. The complainant has refused to receive the dowry articles.

In view of above, the order dated 11.08.2017 passed by this Court is made absolute, subject to furnishing of bail-bonds/surety bonds by the petitioner to the satisfaction of the CJM/Duty Magistrate concerned.

The petition stands allowed.

20.09.2017.
SN

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No