

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

**CRM-M-39626-2017
Date of decision: 01.02.2018**

Veneet Goyal

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JAISHREE THAKUR

Present: Mr. Himmat Singh Deol, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. A.S Sandu, Addl. Advocate General, Punjab.

JAISHREE THAKUR, J. (ORAL)

This is a petition that has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 45 dated 14.09.2017 under Section 498-A IPC, registered at Police Station Women Cell, Bathinda.

This Court was pleased to pass the following order on 27.10.2017 :-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner inter alia contends that the FIR as lodged by the mother of Akanksha Goyal is nothing but an abuse of process of the law. In fact, Akanksha Goyal had earlier solemnized a marriage with one Sh. Gagandeep Singh Mann, which marriage did not survive for more than a period of ten months and the marriage was dissolved by entering into a compromise. In the enquiry that had been conducted by the police, it was also revealed that the complainant Sushma Sexena has also got an FIR registered under

Sections 406/120-B IPC for committing fraud and this matter too was compromised. There are other matters also pending against both the complainant and her daughter Akanksha Goyal, wife of the petitioner, and an attempt is being made to harass the petitioner herein.

Notice of motion for 01.02.2018.

Meanwhile, in the event of arrest, the petitioner be released on interim bail subject to his furnishing personal bonds and surety to the satisfaction of Arresting/Investigating Officer. However, the petitioner shall join the investigation as and when called upon to do so and shall abide by the conditions as provided under Section 438 (2) Cr.P.C.”

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has joined the investigation.

Learned counsel for the respondent-State confirms the factum of joining investigation by the petitioner.

Since the petitioner has joined the investigation, the petition is allowed and interim order dated 27.10.2017 is hereby made absolute subject to the condition that the petitioner will not tamper with evidence or hamper the investigation; will not leave India without permission of the Court and will comply with the conditions contained in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

01.02.2018

Satyawan

**(JAISHREE THAKUR)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes.
No.