

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

CRM M-38623 of 2017.

Date of Decision: 13.11.2017.

Rajesh Kumar @ Roop ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ... Respondent

CORAM : Hon'ble Mr. Justice Jitendra Chauhan

Present : Mr. B.R. Rana-I, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Anju Arora, Addl. AG Punjab.

Mr. Vipin Kumar Sharma, Advocate,
for the complainant.

JITENDRA CHAUHAN.J.(ORAL)

The present petition has been filed under Section 438

Cr.P.C seeking anticipatory bail in case FIR No. 156 dated 15.09.2017

registered under Sections 366, 328 and 506 read with Section 34 IPC at

Police Station Kharar, District SAS Nagar, Mohali.

On 12.10.2017 this Court had passed the following
order:-

“Learned counsel refers to Annexure P-2 to contend that in fact, the prosecutrix alone had gone to Shimla. At the asking of the family members of the prosecutrix, the petitioner had gone to bring her back.

Notice of motion for 13.11.2017.

At the asking of the Court, Ms. Anju Arora, Addl.A.G., Punjab, accepts notice. A complete copy of the paper book has been handed over to learned State counsel, in the Court.

The petitioner is directed to join the investigation.

Meanwhile, in the event of arrest of the petitioner by the Arresting Officer, he shall be released on interim bail subject to the following

conditions:-

1. That he shall make himself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;
2. That 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 and;
3. That he shall not leave India without prior permission of the Court.”

It is contended that in pursuance of the order dated 12.10.2017, the petitioner has joined the investigation. It is further submitted that now the matter has been compromised between the parties.

Learned State counsel, on instructions, states that the petitioner has joined the investigation and he is not required for custodial interrogation.

Learned counsel for the complainant admits the factum of compromise.

In view of above, the order dated 12.10.2017 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.

13.11.2017.
SN

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

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