

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

CRM-M No.31525 of 2017

Date of Decision: January 16, 2018

Singh Ram and another

..... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MRS.JUSTICE LISA GILL

Present: Mr. Bharat Bhushan Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Sanjay K. Saini, AAG, Haryana
for the respondent-State.

Ms. Kamlesh, Advocate for
Mr. Kuldeep Singh, Advocate
for the complainant.

LISA GILL, J. (ORAL)

Petitioners seek the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.0312 dated 29.07.2017 under Sections 406, 498-A and 506 IPC registered at Police Station Indri, District Karnal (Haryana).

Petitioners are the parents-in-law of the complainant. It is submitted that general and omnibus allegations have been raised against the petitioners. The present petitioners are alleged to instigate the complainant's husband to beat her. It is further submitted that the dowry articles belonging to the complainant have since been recovered. It is thus prayed that this petition be allowed.

It is to be noticed that during the pendency of this petition, the matter was placed before the Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court. Mediation between the parties failed. Both the petitioners, their son

and the complainant duly identified by their counsel are present in Court today. The petitioner's son as well as the petitioners have specifically stated that they wish for resumption of matrimonial ties between the complainant and her husband. However, reservations have been expressed by the complainant in this respect. Be that as it may, it is verified by learned counsel for the State on instructions from SI Ram Aasre that recovery of the dowry articles has been effected though learned counsel for the complainant states that all the dowry articles have not been recovered. The petitioners are not reported to be involved in any other criminal case. The co-accused i.e. husband of the complainant has been afforded the concession of bail pending trial.

No useful purpose would be served by taking the petitioners in custody. There are no allegations on behalf of the State that the petitioners are likely to abscond or that they are likely to dissuade the witnesses from deposing true facts in the Court, if released on bail.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances as above but without commenting upon or expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, this petition is allowed. Consequently, order dated 06.09.2017 is made absolute.

None of the observations made hereinabove shall be construed to be a reflection on the merits of the case and shall have no bearing on trial.

(LISA GILL)
JUDGE

January 16, 2018

rittu