

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

115

**CRM-M-43339-2020
Decided on : 23.12.2020**

Dr. Divya Khatter

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and another

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

(Through Video Conferencing)

PRESENT: Mr. Aman Priye Jain, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (Oral)

The petitioner has approached this Court under Section 439(2) Cr.P.C. read with Section 482 Cr.P.C., seeking cancellation of regular bail granted by the Sessions Judge, Faridabad in Bail Application in case FIR No. 642, dated 23.10.2020 (Annexure P-7), under Sections 406, 498-A, 506 IPC, registered at Police Station Sector 7, Faridabad.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the Court below gravely erred in extending the concession of regular bail to respondent No.2 without, inasmuch as, appreciating that there were serious allegations levelled against him by the petitioner of subjecting her to mental and physical torture on account of insufficient dowry given at the time of marriage. It was also urged that the dowry articles were still in the possession of respondent No.2 and yet the trial Court by ignoring the said fact, extended the concession of bail to respondent No.2.

Heard.

The petitioner has primarily challenged the grant of regular bail to respondent No.2 on the ground that the Court below exercised its jurisdiction

arbitrarily, inasmuch as, it failed to appreciate that the petitioner had been

continuously harassed and tortured by respondent No.2. A pointed query was put to the learned counsel for the petitioner as to whether respondent No.2 had breached any of the conditions imposed upon him by the trial Court when the concession of regular bail was extended to him, however, learned counsel for the petitioner very fairly conceded that there had been no such breach on the part of respondent No.2.

The petitioner has thus failed to satisfy this Court *qua* the abuse of liberty granted to respondent No.2 vide impugned order dated 06.11.2020.

In the circumstances, this Court does not find any reason to set aside the impugned order, as bail once granted cannot be cancelled in a mechanical and routine manner. Petition stands dismissed.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

December 23, 2020

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes/No*

Whether Reportable: *Yes/No*