

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

207

CRM-M-16105-2019

Date of Decision:16.01.2020

Pardeep Rawal

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE HARI PAL VERMA.

**Present: Mr. Vikram Pradeep, Advocate for
Mr. Harsh Goyal, Advocate,
for the petitioner.**

Ms. Priyanka Sadar, AAG, Haryana.

**Ms. Jasneet Mehra, Advocate,
for the complainant-respondent No.2.**

HARI PAL VERMA, J.(Oral)

Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.7 dated 29.01.2019 under Sections 323, 406, 498-A, 34 IPC, registered at Women Police Station Narnaul, District Mahendergarh.

This Court had passed the following order on September 17, 2019:-

“Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Shakuntla, submits that recovery of jewellery worth Rs.1,41,000/- is required to be effected from the petitioner.

When counsel for the petitioner has been confronted with this argument, he, on instructions from the petitioner, who is present in Court, states that though no recovery is required to be effected from the petitioner, as the complainant has taken

all jewellery with her, however, at this stage, the petitioner is ready to deposit Rs.1,41,000/- with the trial Court, which shall be subject to the outcome of the trial.

Adjourned to 04.11.2019.

In the meanwhile, the petitioner is directed to appear before the Investigating Officer to join investigation and get the recovery of other dowry articles effected. The petitioner is further directed to join the investigation as and when directed by the investigating agency and abide by the terms and conditions laid down under Section 438(2) CrPC. In the event of arrest of the petitioner, he shall be released on ad interim bail to the satisfaction of the arresting officer.

In the case the complainant is not ready to take the other dowry articles back, the Investigating Officer shall prepare an inventory thereof and submit the same before this Court.”

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that pursuant to the order dated September 17, 2019 passed by this Court, petitioner has deposited a sum of Rs.1,41,000/- with the trial Court and has joined the investigation.

Learned State counsel does not dispute the aforesaid fact and states that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is no more required at this stage.

Learned counsel for the complainant has argued that the articles recovered in the case are not those articles which belong to the complainant.

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

Considering the fact that the petitioner has deposited an amount of Rs.1,41,000/- with the trial Court and has joined the investigation and his custodial interrogation is no more required, present petition is allowed and the interim bail granted to the petitioner vide order dated September 17,

However, if required, the petitioner shall continue to join investigation as and when required to do so and shall abide by the terms and conditions, as laid down under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

January 16, 2020
seema

(HARI PAL VERMA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No