

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

CRM-M-3275-2019 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 3.9.2019

Karamdin and another ... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Ravi Malhotra, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Kirat Singh Sidhu, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab,
assisted by HC Mander Singh.

Ms. Reena, Advocate for the complainant.

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J.

1. The petitioners have approached this Court seeking grant of anticipatory bail in a case registered against them vide FIR No.72 dated 29.8.2018 under Sections 406/498-A IPC at Police Station Women, District Patiala
2. The FIR was registered at the instance of Nazma Begum wherein it has been alleged that she was married to Karamdin on 4.5.2017 and her parents had given articles of dowry as per their status but shortly after her marriage her husband Karamdin, father-in-law Jang Mohamad, mother-in-law Pammi Begum and brother-in-law Ravinder Khan started giving beatings to her in order to press upon their demand of more dowry. It is alleged that on one occasion, her mother-in-law pushed her and threw her on stove on account of which she sustained injuries on her arm and on account of which her brother brought her back to her parental home.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that he has falsely been implicated in the present case on account of matrimonial incompatibility and that it is the complainant who had left her matrimonial home out of her own accord. It has further been submitted that the allegations of alleged beatings and the complainant having been pushed on the stove are not substantiated from any medical evidence and are patently false.
4. Opposing the petition, the learned State counsel has submitted that since the petitioner is specifically named in the FIR, no case for grant of anticipatory bail is made out.
5. I have considered rival submissions addressed before this Court. The case in hand is apparently is an outcome of the matrimonial discord. At this stage, this court would refrain from making any expression as regards veracity of allegations levelled in the FIR. In any case, the petitioner is already stated to have joined investigation. In these circumstances, custodial interrogation is not warranted.
6. The petition, as such, is accepted and the interim directions issued vide order dated 4.4.2019 are hereby made absolute subject to the condition that the petitioner shall appear and join the investigation as and when called upon to do so and cooperate with the Investigating Officer and shall abide by the conditions as provided under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.
7. The petition is accepted accordingly.

3.9.2019

kamal

(Gurvinder Singh Gill)
Judge

Whether speaking /reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes / No
Yes / No