

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

**CRM-M-38288-2016
Date of decision-18.07.2017**

Balvir Singh and another

...Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. S.K.Bokolia, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. A.S.Gill, Senior DAG, Punjab.

Mr. B.S.Sidhu, Advocate for respondent No.2.

JITENDRA CHAUHAN, J. (Oral)

By filing the present petition under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, the petitioners have sought anticipatory bail in FIR No. 48 dated 29.09.2016 registered under Sections 406 and 498-A of the Indian Penal Code at Police Station Women, Bathinda.

On 25.10.2016, this Court had passed the following order:-

“Learned counsel, inter alia, contends that the petitioners are parents-in-law of the complainant and the allegations against the petitioners are general in nature. Even they are ready to give the fix amount for education of their grandchild.

On oral request of learned counsel for the petitioners, complainant-Amandeep Kaur wife of Amrik Singh, resident of Adarsh Nagar, Street No.7, Bathinda, District Bathinda, is impleaded as respondent No.2.

Subject to deposit of ₹25,000/- as litigation expenses before the Registry of this Court, notice of motion be issued to the respondents for 25.01.2017.

Meanwhile, the petitioners are directed to join the investigation as and when called by the Investigating Officer. In the event of their arrest, they shall be released on bail by the Investigating Officer on their 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 persons 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 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 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 was granted under that section.”*

The learned State counsel submits that in pursuance of the order dated 25.10.2016, the petitioners have joined the investigation and they are not required for custodial interrogation.

As per the office report, a compromise has been reached between the parties as reflected in Flag 'A' i.e. Report of the Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court.

In view of the above, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the interim bail granted by this Court vide order dated 25.10.2016, 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.

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

July 18, 2017
vanita

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

