

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

CRM-M-24404-2016(O&M)
Date of decision: 7.4.2017

Ram Lal

....Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab & Anr.

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE REKHA MITTAL

Present: Mr. Lakhwinder Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Ankur Jain, AAG Punjab.

Mr. Aakash Singla, Advocate for the complainant.

REKHA MITTAL, J.(Oral)

Mediation failed. Counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has already joined investigation in compliance with interim bail granted by this Court vide order dated 21.07.2016 and has got recovered all the articles of dowry whatever was in his possession. It is further submitted that the Court below dismissed the application for grant of pre-arrest bail on the ground that one gold ring is yet to be recovered from him. It is further submitted that though the gold ring is not in possession of the petitioner but he is ready to compensate the complainant on payment of reasonable amount. The last submission made by counsel for the petitioner is that he is ready to face the proceedings, in accordance with law, without any default.

Counsel for the State concedes to the position that the petitioner has already joined investigation and most of the articles, both jewellery and domestic, have already been recovered. He has submitted that the gold ring is yet to be recovered from the petitioner.

Counsel for the complainant, on the contrary, has submitted that besides gold ring, one gold set is also to be recovered.

I have heard counsel for the parties and perused the records.

In the light of judgment of this Court **PritPal Singh vs. State of Punjab and another, 2014(5) RCR (Criminal) 771** pre-arrest bail cannot be declined merely because some more recovery is to be effected.

However, in view of the above, the petition stands disposed of; interim bail granted to the petitioner vide order dated 21.07.2016 is made absolute subject to the following conditions:-

- (i) he shall make himself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;
- (ii) he shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;
- (iii) he shall not leave India without the previous permission of the Court.
- (iv) he shall prepare a demand draft of Rs.20,000/- in the name of the complainant and the same shall be handed over to the Investigating Officer within a period of 20 days but payment of amount of Rs.20,000/- to the complainant shall be subject to outcome of the litigation.

Failure of the petitioner to comply with the direction with regard to payment of Rs.20,000/- would entail dismissal of the petition.

APRIL 7, 2017
'D. Gulati'

(REKHA MITTAL)
JUDGE

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