

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

CRM-M-33487-2016

Date of decision: 17.11.2017

Amandeep Grover

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JAISHREE THAKUR

Present: Mr. J.S. Dadwal, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. A.S. Dhaliwal, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Jasjeet Singh Virk, Advocate,
for the complainant.

JAISHREE THAKUR, J. (ORAL)

This is a petition that has been filed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.102 dated 30.07.2016 under Sections 354C, 509, 34 of the IPC and later on added Section 498-A of the IPC and Section 66-E of the Information Technology Act, registered at Police Station Dugri, Ludhiana.

This Court was pleased to pass the following order on 04.10.2016 :-

“Learned counsel for State has informed that during investigation on 27.8.2016, a mobile phone has been recovered from the petitioner and the same has been sent to FSL on 1.9.2016.

Ms. G.K.Mann, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of complainant along with complainant present in person in Court today. She has handed over a list of dowry articles to Investigating Officer in Court today. She further submits that petitioner is having a photostat shop in the office of SDM, Zeera.

Investigating Officer shall verify the income of the petitioner from the office of SDM, Zeera and file a status report to said fact.

Complainant shall further provide the information to the Investigating Officer with regard to property of the petitioner.

Adjourned to 17.11.2016.

Meanwhile, petitioner is directed to join the investigation as and when called by the Investigating Officer. In the event of their 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 themselves available for interrogation by Police Officer as and when required;*
- ii. a condition that the persons 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. a condition that the persons 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 were granted under that section.”*

Learned counsel for the complainant submits that the matter has been compromised and in terms of the compromise a quashing petition i.e. **CRM-M-29267-2017** has been filed, which is now pending for 07.12.2017.

In view of the fact that the matter has been settled amicably between the parties, the petition is allowed and interim order dated 04.10.2016 is hereby made absolute subject to the condition that the petitioner will not tamper with evidence or hamper the investigation; will not leave India without permission of the Court and will comply with the conditions contained in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

17.11.2017

Satyawan

**(JAISHREE THAKUR)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes.
No.