

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

CRM No. M-2115 of 2017.

Date of Decision: 18.07.2017.

Vikram

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

... Respondents

CORAM : Hon'ble Mr. Justice Jitendra Chauhan

Present : Mr. G.S. Simble, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. AS Gill, Sr. DAG Punjab.

JITENDRA CHAUHAN.J.(ORAL)

The present petition has been filed under Section 438 the Cr.P.C seeking anticipatory bail in case FIR No. 156 dated 25.11.2016 registered under Sections 498-A and 406 IPC at Police Station City Batala Police District Batala.

On 23.01.2017 this Court had passed the following order:-

“Learned counsel, inter alia, contends that the marriage of the petitioner was solemnized on 09.03.2015 and no child was born out from the said wedlock. Moreover, all the allegations raised in the FIR are highly improbable and concocted one.

On oral request of learned counsel for the petitioner, complainant- Sonia daughter of Rajinder Kumar Nayyar, resident of House No.494/3, Bank Colony, Near PSPCL office, Tehsil Batala, District Gurdaspur, is impleaded as respondent No.2.

Subject to deposit of Rs.25,000/- as litigation expenses before the Registry of this Court, notice of motion be issued to the respondents for 20.02.2017.

Meanwhile, the petitioner is directed to join the investigation as and when called by the Investigating Officer. In the event of his arrest, he shall be released on bail by the Investigating Officer on his furnishing bail bonds/sureties to his satisfaction, subject to the conditions mentioned below, as envisaged in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C:-

- i. a condition that the person shall make himself available for interrogation by Police Officer as and when required;
- ii. a condition that the person shall not, directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any persons acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade them from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;
- iii. a condition that the person shall not leave India without the previous permission of the Court;
- iv. such other condition as may be imposed under sub section (3) of Section 437, as if the bail was granted under that section. ”

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.

18.07.2017.
SN

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

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