

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

Sr. No.205

CRM-M No.46705 of 2016
Date of decision: 07.02.2017

Sanjiv Kumar

....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana and another

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK SIBAL

Present: Mr. V.K. Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Manish Bansal, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Pankaj Mehta, Advocate
for the complainant.

* * *

DEEPAK SIBAL, J. (Oral)

Through the present petition filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C., the petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in FIR No.81 dated 05.09.2016, registered under Sections 323, 342, 365, 452, 506 IPC and 08 of the POCSO Act, at Women Police Station Yamuna Nagar, District Yamuna Nagar.

Vide order dated 27.12.2016, while issuing notice of motion, this Court had ordered that in the event of arrest, petitioner shall be released on ad-interim anticipatory bail to the satisfaction of the arresting officer.

As per the FIR, the petitioner had outraged the modesty of the complainant's daughter.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has falsely been implicated for the reason that there was scuffle between the

parties, in which the complainant had inflicted injuries on the head of the petitioner. Due to these injuries, the petitioner had been referred to PGIMER, Chandigarh, where he was treated. In this regard, the petitioner had lodged an FIR against the complainant. As a counter-blast, the present FIR was got lodged by the complainant. He further submitted that the matter between the parties stands compromised.

Learned State counsel submits that in pursuance to the ad-interim anticipatory bail granted to the petitioner, he has joined the investigation and no longer needed for any further questioning.

Learned counsel for the complainant admits that the matter has been compromised between the petitioner and the complainant.

In the view of the above, the petition is allowed and order dated 27.12.2016 granting ad-interim anticipatory bail to the petitioner is made absolute subject to the conditions as prescribed under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

Nothing observed herein above shall be considered to be an expression of opinion by this Court on the merits of the case.

(DEEPAK SIBAL)
JUDGE

February 07, 2017

Jyoti 1

(i)	Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
(ii)	Whether reportable	Yes/No