

216-2

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

CRM-M-33232-2020 (O&M)

Date of decision: December 22, 2020

Rohit Sheoran

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

Present: Mr. Vivek Khatri, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Deepak Grewal, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. R.S. Malik, Advocate
for the complainant.

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J. (Oral)

Prayer made in the petition is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.442 dated 13.09.2020 under Sections 294,323,376,377,498-A,509 IPC registered at P.S Sadar Sonapat, District Sonapat.

The operative part of the order dated 20.10.2020, reads as under:-

“The complaint has been filed by wife of petitioner with allegation that her marriage was solemnized with petitioner on 5.12.2013. It is alleged that marriage was outcome of fraud. There were 50 criminal cases against petitioner which were not disclosed at the time of marriage. Since from the beginning, complainant has been treated with cruelty on account of demand of dowry. A male child was born to them on 13.9.2015. It is alleged that brother in law of complainant is also living in the matrimonial house. He has physically harassed complainant for almost 3 years. When complainant disclosed this fact, husband of petitioner instead of supporting her, abused her and given beatings to her. The child of complainant was forcibly snatched and she was thrown out of matrimonial house.

Learned counsel for petitioner states that as on date, the child is with complainant. The petitioner has filed a petition under Sections 7, 10, 12, 17, 25 of Guardian and Wards Act read with Sections 6 and 13 of Hindu Minority and Guardianship Act seeking custody of child. He further states that petitioner is willing to reconcile with complainant.

Notice of motion.”

Counsel for the petitioner submits that in pursuance to the order dated 20.10.2020, the petitioner has appeared before the Investigating Officer and has joined the investigation.

Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Satnam Singh, has not disputed the factual position.

In view of the same, the present petition is allowed and the order dated 20.10.2020 is made absolute, subject to the conditions envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

(ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN)
JUDGE

December 22, 2020
satish

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