

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-23679-2019

Date of decision: 30.05.2019

Savita and others

... Petitioners

Vs.

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

Present: Mr. Vikram Jeet Singh, Advocate for
Mr. Apoorv Sangwan, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Naveen Sheoran, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Munish Mittal, Advocate
for the complainant.

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J. (ORAL)

Prayer in this petition is for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR
No.397 dated 01.04.2019 under Sections 148, 149, 323, 452, 506 IPC,
registered at Police Station City Jagadhri.

While granting interim bail to the petitioners, following order was
passed by this Court on 23.05.2019: -

*“.....Counsel for the petitioners has submitted that on the date of
the alleged incident, some talks regarding the matrimonial dispute
between the son of the complainant and the daughter of petitioner
No.4 were going on as the petitioners were called at the residence
of the complainant. It is further argued that, in fact, some hot
words were exchanged against each other and the FIR has been*

registered after a delay of 19 days and even in the FIR, there is a recital that even the talks were going on for the compromise. It is also submitted that already a petition under Section 9 of the Hindu Marriage Act as well as the petition filed under the Domestic Violence Act filed by the daughter of petitioner No.4 is pending before the trial Court and the present FIR is just a counter-blast to the same....”

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that in pursuance of the aforesaid order, petitioners have joined the investigation and are not required for any further investigation.

Learned State counsel, on instructions from SI Darshan Singh, has not disputed the factual position and states that the petitioners are no more required for any further investigation.

Learned counsel for the complainant has however opposed the prayer for bail on the ground that during pendency of petition before the Additional Sessions Judge, some talks for compromise were going on, however, the same failed and thereafter, the anticipatory bail application was dismissed by the Additional Sessions Judge.

Without commenting anything on merits of the case, considering the submissions, as noticed in the order dated 23.05.2019, this petition is allowed and the interim bail granted to the petitioners vide order dated 23.05.2019 is made absolute subject to the conditions envisaged under Section 438 (2) Cr.P.C.

[ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN]
JUDGE

30.05.2019
vishnu

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether Reportable : Yes/No