

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-20557-2020(O&M)

Date of decision: 11.08.2020

Raghu Chhottra

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

Present:- Mr.Amit Dhawan, Advocate for the petitioner
Mr. V.G.Jauhar, Sr. DAG, Punjab

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J. (ORAL)

On 27.7.2020, the following order was passed by this

Court:-

“The petitioner prays for grant of pre-arrest bail in a criminal case arising in an FIR No. 135 dated 08.07.2020, registered under Section 406 & 498-A IPC at Police Station Division No. 2, Pathankot.

In a nutshell, the case of the prosecution has been noticed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Pathankot in para 3 of his order dated 20.07.2020, which is extracted as under:-

“The brief facts of the case are that the FIR was registered on the basis of application moved by the complainant to SSP Pathankot with the allegations complainant

was married to accused/ applicant Raghu Chhottra on 19.04.2019. As per the demand of Raghu Chhottra and his parents,, the marriage function was arranged at Vista Resort Jalandhar. The parents of the complainant spent an amount of Rs.10 lakhs for the said ceremony. In the marriage the parents of the complainant have given one bracelet weighing 15 grams to Raghu Chhottra. After solemnization of marriage, the dowry was handed over to Raghu Chhottra and his family members individually. After one week of marriage, Raghu Chhottra and his family members started to harass the complainant for bringing insufficient dowry and demanded an amount of Rs 25 lakhs. On 15.05.2019 the complainant was sent to Pathankot in order to talk with her parents for additional dowry and was made to stay there till 22.05.2019. The complainant was brought back to matrimonial house. However the complainant was expelled from the matrimonial house o 16.06.2019. The offence was made out under section 498-A, 406 of IPC”.

Learned counsel for the petitioner

submits that the dispute between the petitioner and the first informant has arisen out of a marital discord and the petitioner is ready to settle the dispute.

Notice of motion.

On the request of this Court, Mr. Dhruv Dyal, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the respondent.

In the event of his arrest, the petitioner be released on interim pre-arrest bail on his furnishing personal bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting/Investigating Officer. However, the petitioner shall join the investigation as and when called upon to do so. The petitioner shall also abide by the conditions as envisaged in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

List on 11.08.2020.”

Learned State counsel on instructions from ASI Harpreet Singh has submitted that the petitioner has joined the investigation, cooperated and is not required for further custodial interrogation.

In view of the above, the order dated 27.7.2020 is hereby made absolute.

Petition stands allowed.

11.08.2020

rekha

Whether speaking/reasoned

Whether Reportable

(ANIL KSHETARPAL)

JUDGE

Yes / No

Yes / No