

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

CRM-M-23953 of 2017 (O&M)

Date of Decision:20.03.2018

Radhika

..... Petitioner

Versus

U.T. Chandigarh

..... Respondent

AND

CRM-M-29579 of 2017(O&M)

Sukhjeet Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

U.T. Chandigarh

..... Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MRS.JUSTICE LISA GILL

Present: Mr.B.S.Aulakh, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Dahodar Khurana, Advocate
for Mr. Anil Kumar Lamdharia, APP, UT, Chandigarh.

Mr.G.S.Brar, Advocate
for the complainant.

LISA GILL, J(Oral).

This order shall dispose of CRM-M-23953 of 2017 and CRM-M-29579 of 2017. For the sake of convenience, facts are extracted from CRM-M-23953 of 2017.

Both the petitioners seek the concession of anticipatory bail in FIR No. 53 dated 10.04.2017, under Sections 199, 420, 494 IPC, registered at Police Station Sector-3, Chandigarh.

As per allegations in the FIR, both the petitioners had filed CRM-M-11316 of 2017, under Section 482 Cr.P.C., seeking directions to the Senior Superintendent of Police, Sri Muktsar Sahib, for protection of their life and liberty. It is mentioned in this petition that they were not

previously married and it was their first marriage which was solemnized on 28.03.2017. They however failed to bring to the notice of the Court that the petitioner Sukhjeet Singh was already married to one Kuldeep Kaur. On the directions of this Court on 03.04.2017, the abovesaid FIR was registered against the petitioners.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submit that both the petitioners have joined investigation. They undertake to face the proceedings and not abuse the concession of anticipatory bail, if confirmed.

Learned counsel for the State, on instructions from HC Jasbir Singh, verifies that both the petitioners have joined investigation and their custodial interrogation is not required.

There are no allegations on behalf of the State that the petitioners are likely to abscond or that they likely to dissuade the witnesses from deposing true facts in the Court, if released on anticipatory bail.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances as above, but without commenting upon or expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, both these petitions are allowed. Consequently, order dated 31.07.2017 in CRM-M-23953 of 2017 and order dated 29.11.2017 in CRM-M-29579 of 2017, are made absolute.

It is clarified that none of the observations made hereinabove shall be construed to be a reflection on the merits of the case. The same are solely confined for the purpose of decision of the present petitions.

20.03.2018
s.khan

[LISA GILL]
Judge

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