

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

CRM No. M-3911 of 2017.

Date of Decision: 11.09.2017.

Prince

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

... Respondents

CORAM : Hon'ble Mr. Justice Jitendra Chauhan

Present : Mr. Rajesh Bansal, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Mahima Yashpal, AAG Haryana
assisted by ASI Ram Nahar.

Mr. Jagtar Kureel, Advocate,
for respondent No.2/complainant.

JITENDRA CHAUHAN.J.(ORAL)

The present petition has been filed under Section 438
the Cr.P.C seeking anticipatory bail in case FIR No. 1565 dated
09.12.2016 registered under Sections 498-A, 406, 506, 323 and 377
IPC at Police Station City Panipat, District Panipat.

On 07.02.2017 this Court had passed the following
order:-

“Counsel for the petitioner inter alia contends that marriage was
solemnized on 26.02.2016 and due to temperamental differences
between the husband and wife, present FIR has been lodged. It is
further submitted that the petitioner is ready to join investigation
and get recover articles of Istridhan whatever is in his possession.
The petitioner is ready to settle the dispute one way or the other as
both the husband and wife are in their mid 30's and can resettle in

life, in case the parties agree to part ways. The petitioner is even ready to rehabilitate the complainant in the matrimonial home.

On oral request made by counsel for the petitioner, the complainant – Deepika is ordered to be impleaded as respondent No.2.

Amended memo of parties be filed in the Registry of the Court.

Notice of motion for 12.05.2017. The petitioner is directed to join investigation within a period of 10 days and he shall be released on interim bail subject to the following conditions:-

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

It is contended that in pursuance of the order dated 07.02.2017, the petitioner has joined the investigation.

Learned State counsel, on instructions, states that complainant refused to undergo the medical examination to prove the factum of offence under Section 377 IPC. She even refused to collect the dowry articles. The petitioner has joined the investigation and he is not required for custodial interrogation.

The matter was posted for mediation. However, no settlement could be reached between the parties.

In view of above, the order dated 07.02.2017 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.

11.09.2017.
SN

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

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