

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

CRM No. M-43348 of 2014.

Date of Decision: 28.09.2017.

Dr. Jaibir and another

... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and another

... Respondents

CORAM : Hon'ble Mr. Justice Jitendra Chauhan

Present : Mr. M.K. Dogra, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Ms. Mahima Yashpal, AAG Haryana.

Mr. Ram Bilas Gupta, Advocate,
for respondent No.2.

JITENDRA CHAUHAN.J.(ORAL)

The present petition has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C seeking anticipatory bail in case FIR No. 129 dated 14.11.2014 registered under Sections 323, 498-A, 406 and 506 IPC at Police Station Tigaon, District Faridabad.

On 22.12.2014 this Court had passed the following order:-

“Learned counsel states that apart from the merits of the case the petitioners are very keen that the dispute between their son and daughter-inlaw be settled and though the petitioners want that the marriage should be rehabilitated but the complainant party are very keen that this marriage be dissolved. He further states that the petitioners' son is ready to go with any of these options.

On the asking of the Court, the complainant-Dr. Priyanka Nagar,

daughter of Sh. Sumer Singh Nagar, resident of Village Tigaon,
District Faridabad is impleaded as respondent No.2.

Registry is directed to make necessary corrections in the memo of
parties.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. Anmol Malik, A.A.G., Haryana,
accepts notice on behalf of the respondent No.1.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has supplied a copy of the
petition to the learned AAG today in Court itself.

Learned counsel for the petitioners further undertakes to serve the
respondent No.2 by way of dasti process. May do so. Dasti only.

Adjourned to 05.02.2015.

In the meantime, arrest of the petitioners shall remain stayed.”

It is contended that in pursuance of the order dated
22.12.2014, the petitioners have joined the investigation. The matter
was referred to Mediation Centre. The complainant is not taking the
dowry articles.

However, learned counsel for the complainant
submits that the articles were of inferior quality.

Learned State counsel, on instructions, states that the
petitioners have joined the investigation and they are not required for
custodial interrogation. The complainant has refused to take possession
of the dowry articles lying at the Police Station.

In view of above, the order dated 22.12.2014 passed
by this Court is made absolute, subject to furnishing of bail-
bonds/surety bonds by the petitioners to the satisfaction of the

CJM/Duty Magistrate concerned.

The petition stands allowed.

28.09.2017.
SN

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

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