

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

CRM-M -5306 of 2017 (O&M)

Date of decision: 29.08.2017

Narinder Kumar

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. G.S. Jagpal, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. A.S. Gill, Sr. DAG, Punjab
assisted by ASI Sukhdev Singh.

Mr. Gopal Mittal, Advocate for respondent No.2.

Jitendra Chauhan, J. (Oral)

By filing the present petition under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, the petitioner has sought anticipatory bail in FIR No.154 dated 23.12.2016, registered under Sections 406 and 498-A of IPC, at Police Station Women Cell, District Ludhiana.

On 17.02.2017, this Court had passed the following order:-

“Counsel for the petitioner inter alia contends that root cause of the dispute between the complainant and the petitioner is that the complainant has been pressing hard to have a separate residence from in laws family. The petitioner is ready to rehabilitate the complainant or settle the dispute in whatever way it is possible. It is further submitted that there is possibility of the dispute being settled

with mediation by a trained Mediator but in case father of the complainant is kept away from those mediation proceedings.

On oral request made by counsel for the petitioner, Neelam Rani complainant is ordered to be impleaded as a respondent.

Amended Memo of Parties be filed in the Registry.

Notice of motion for 28.4.2017.

In the meanwhile, the petitioner shall join the investigation within a period of 10 days. In case, he joins the investigation within the stipulated period, he shall be released on interim bail by the investigating officer subject to the following conditions:-

- (i) He shall join the investigation as and when required by the Investigating Officer.*
- (ii) He shall not offer any threat, promise or inducement to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing the same to the Investigating Officer/Court; and*
- (iii) He shall not leave the limits of this country without prior permission of the Court.”*

It is contended that in pursuance of the order dated 17.02.2017, the petitioner has joined the investigation.

The learned State counsel, on instructions submits that the petitioner has joined the investigation and he is not required for custodial interrogation. The challan stands presented.

The learned counsel for the complainant/respondent No.2 opposes the bail application.

Keeping in view the fact that the petitioner has repeatedly joined the investigation; the challan stands presented,

without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the interim bail granted by this Court vide order dated 17.02.2017, 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.

29.08.2017
sumit.k

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

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