

**204-2 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

**CRM-M No.15381 of 2020
Date of Decision:25.08.2020**

NEELAM

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

..Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK SIBAL

Present: Mr. Mohan Singla, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vikas Bhardwaj, AAG, Haryana.

DEEPAK SIBAL, J. (ORAL)

Case taken up through video conferencing.

Through the present petition the petitioner seeks the grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.310 dated 24.03.2020, registered under Sections 323/452/506/509/34 IPC at Police Station City Sonipat, District Sonipat.

On 17.06.2020, while issuing notice of motion, this Court had directed that in the event of her arrest, subject to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer/Illaq Magistrate, the petitioner shall be released on interim bail. The petitioner was further directed to join investigation as and when called upon to do so as also to abide by the conditions as provided under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

Seeking anticipatory bail learned counsel for the petitioner submits that on 19.11.2019 the petitioner's daughter-Swati had got lodged

a FIR against her in-laws after which CRM-M-54815 of 2019 was filed by the in-laws of the petitioner's daughter seeking therein quashing of the said FIR on the basis of a compromise. Such petition was disposed of by this Court on 10.02.2020 by directing the Illaqa Magistrate/Trial Court to determine as to whether the compromise stated to have been arrived at between the parties was genuine. Before the Illaqa Magistrate the petitioner's daughter stated that no compromise had been arrived at between the parties on which she was assaulted by her in-laws and in this regard, on 18.03.2020, she filed a complaint with the Women Police Station, Sonipat. As a counter blast to the above, on 24.03.2020, the present FIR was lodged against the petitioner and other family members at Police Station City, Sonipat. The petitioner's daughter was arrested on 02.06.2020 and thereafter she was granted bail by the Chief Judicial Magistrate, Sonipat. In view of the above, it was submitted that the present FIR was only a backlash to the FIR and complaint lodged by the petitioner's daughter.

Learned State counsel submitted that under the interim order passed by this Court the petitioner has already joined investigation; has fully co-operated with the investigating agency and that her custodial interrogation is no longer required.

Keeping in view the facts as narrated above and particularly because the dispute between the parties arises from a matrimonial discord as also in line with the submission made by the learned State counsel that the petitioner has joined investigation; has fully co-operated with the investigating agency and that her custodial interrogation is not required by the investigating agency, this Court is of the considered opinion that

custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not warranted.

In view of the above, the order of this Court dated 17.06.2020, granting ad interim anticipatory bail to the petitioner is made absolute.

Nothing observed herein-above shall be considered to be an expression of opinion by this Court on the merits of the case.

August 25, 2020

Jyoti-IV

(DEEPAK SIBAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasonedYes/NoWhether ReportableYes/No