

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

CRM-M-20410-2020

Date of Decision: November 02, 2020

DEEPAK

..... Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

..... Respondent(s)

CORAM:- HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE LISA GILL

Present: Mr. Ankur Malik, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Gagandeep Singh Chhina, Asstt. AG, Haryana.

LISA GILL, J.

This matter is being taken up for hearing through video conferencing due to outbreak of the pandemic, COVID-19.

Prayer in this petition is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No. 167 dated 21.06.2020, under Sections 376(2)N, 341, 376, 511, 506, 34 IPC, Police Station Barauda, District Sonipat.

Contentions on behalf of the petitioner, noted while issuing notice of motion on 27.07.2020, read as under:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that it is a case where the petitioner and the alleged victim were having a love affair since the last about 4 years and that the FIR came to be lodged due to some misunderstanding which has now been resolved and in fact the parties have now solemnized marriage and are residing happily as husband and wife.”

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has since joined investigation and undertakes to fully cooperate. It is thus prayed that this petition be allowed.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties.

Learned counsel for the State, on instructions from ASI Naresh Kumar, confirms that the petitioner has indeed joined investigation and has fully cooperated. Furthermore, it is verified that the petitioner and the alleged victim have since solemnized marriage and are residing together as husband and wife. It is also affirmed that the petitioner is not involved in any other criminal case.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances as above but without commenting upon or expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, this petition is allowed. Consequently, order dated 27.07.2020 is made absolute. Needless to say, the petitioner shall comply with the conditions stipulated under Section 438(2) of Cr.P.C.

It is clarified that none of the observations made hereinabove shall be construed to be a reflection on the merits of the case. The same are solely confined for the purpose of decision of the present petition.

November 02, 2020

Sunil

(LISA GILL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether reportable: Yes/No