

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

CRM No. M-1848 of 2017.

Date of Decision: 20.04.2017.

Rajbeer	...	Petitioner
	Versus	
State of Haryana	...	Respondent

CORAM : Hon'ble Mr. Justice Jitendra Chauhan

Present : Mr. Chanderhas Yadav, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Naveen Kaushik, Addl. AG, Haryana.

JITENDRA CHAUHAN.J.(ORAL)

The present petition has been filed under Section 438
the Cr.P.C seeking anticipatory bail in case FIR No. 562 dated
31.12.2016 registered under Section 354-A IPC at Police Station
Mahendergarh, District Mahendergarh.

On 23.01.2017 this Court had passed the following
order:-

“Counsel for the petitioner inter alia contends that the present FIR
has been lodged as a counter to FIR No.267 dated 07.06.2016
lodged by the petitioner against father of the complainant. It is
further submitted that there was an affair between complainant and
the petitioner and the complainant had written a series of love
letters to the petitioner and some of the letters have been produced
on record. It is further submitted that when family of the
complainant came to know about the same, they reacted and caused
injuries to the petitioner resulting in lodging of criminal
proceedings in June 2016, in which investigation is pending. It is
further argued that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not
required and he is ready to join investigation and face the

proceedings.

Notice of motion for 20.04.2017.

In the meantime, the petitioner shall join the investigation within a period of 10 days. In case, he joins the investigation within the stipulated period, he shall be released on interim bail by the investigating officer subject to the following conditions:-

- (i) He shall join the investigation as and when required by the Investigating Officer.
- (ii) He shall not offer any threat, promise or inducement to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing the same to the Investigating Officer/Court; and
- (iii) He shall not leave the limits of this country without prior permission of the Court.”

It is contended that in pursuance of the order dated 23.01.2017, 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.

In view of above, the order dated 23.01.2017 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.

20.04.2017.
SN

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

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