

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

CRM-M -3449 of 2017 (O&M)
Date of decision: 14.07.2017

Anmol Gupta

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. M.S. Vinaik, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Ms. Mahima Yashpal, AAG, Haryana.
assisted by SI Prakash Kaur.

Ms. Palak Jain, Advocate for
Mr. Rajat Gautam, Advocate for respondent No.2.

Jitendra Chauhan, J. (Oral)

By filing the present petition under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, the petitioner has sought anticipatory bail in FIR No.153 dated 27.11.2016, registered under Sections 313, 323, 354, 377, 406, 498-A, 506, 511 read with Section 34 of IPC, at Women Police Station Karnal, District Karnal.

On 03.02.2017, this Court had passed the following order:-

“Marriage of the petitioner was solemnized with complainant-respondent No.2 on 29.01.2015 in Udaipur. Thereafter, they separated in September, 2016. Petitioner as well as the complainant were doing MBA in Mumbai, where they developed friendly relationship.

At this stage, an attempt can be made to refer the matter to Mediation and Conciliation Centre for an amicable settlement between the parties.

Subject to deposit of Rs.30,000/- before the Registry of this Court as litigation expenses to be paid to the complainant, notice of motion be issued for 27.03.2017.

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 following conditions, as envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C:-

(i) that the petitioner shall make himself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;

(ii) that the petitioner 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 them from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;

(iii) that the petitioner 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.”

It is contended that in pursuance of the order dated 03.02.2017, the petitioner has joined the investigation, however, the learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent No.2 states that certain household articles like refrigerator, T.V., A.C. have not been recovered.

The learned State counsel, on instructions submits that the petitioner has joined the investigation and states that no such bills of articles have been supplied to the investigating agency.

Keeping in view the fact that the petitioner has

repeatedly joined the investigation, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the interim bail granted by this Court vide order dated 03.02.2017, is made absolute, subject to furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

The petition stands allowed.

14.07.2017

sumit.k

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes	No
Whether Reportable:	Yes	No