

208 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-41763-2018

Date of decision : 04.12.2018

Robin Yadav @ Robin Rao

.....Petitioner(s)

versus

State of Haryana and another

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANITA CHAUDHRY

Present: Mr. Himanshu Arora, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Mahima Yashpal, AAG, Haryana.

None for respondent No.2/complainant.

ANITA CHAUDHRY, J(ORAL)

Fresh *Vakalatnama* has been filed on behalf of the petitioner.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that pursuant to order dated 26.09.2018, petitioner has joined the investigation and has cooperated.

The complainant was to produce the divorce decree but there is no representation on behalf of the complainant/respondent No.2.

Learned State counsel informs that complainant/respondent No.2 has given an affidavit that she had obtained a *Panchayati* divorce in 2010. On instructions, she further states that the petitioner has joined the investigation.

Looking to all these circumstances, but without commenting on the merits of the case, the petition is allowed and order dated 26.09.2018 granting interim bail to the petitioner is made absolute subject to the conditions laid down in Section 438 Sub Section 2 Clauses (i)(ii) and (iii) of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

04.12.2018

ps-I

**(ANITA CHAUDHRY)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No