

207 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-25033-2021
Date of Decision: 08.10.2021

Bhaskar Gupta

... Petitioner

v/s

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIVEK PURI

Present: Mr. Rajesh K.Dadwal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ramandeep Sandhu, Sr. DAG Punjab.

*(The case has been taken up through video conferencing on
account of Covid-19 pandemic)*

* * *

VIVEK PURI, J. (ORAL)

The petitioner is seeking anticipatory bail under Section 438 of
the Code of Criminal Procedure. On 02.07.2021 following order was
passed:

“Prayer in this petition is for grant of anticipatory bail to
the petitioner in FIR No.111 dated 10.05.2021 under Sections
498-A, 506 IPC registered at Police Station City Nawanshahar,
District SBS Nagar.

Learned counsel contends that both the parties were
married earlier, hence the marriage which was solemnized on
06.02.2021 was a simple affair and not as lavish as alleged in the
FIR in question. He further contends that the complainant left
the matrimonial home just after 26 days of their marriage and
soon thereafter filed a petition under Section 125 Cr.P.C., and
Section 13 of the Hindu Marriage Act. Learned counsel submits
that the antecedents of the complainant would reveal that she
had been indulging in a similar conduct when she was earlier
married.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. Luvinder Sofat, Assistant
Advocate General, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the
respondent-State.

Adjourned to 08.10.2021.

Meanwhile, petitioner is directed to join the investigation as and when required by the investigating officer. In the event of his arrest, he shall be admitted to interim bail on his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting/Investigating Officer. The petitioner shall abide by the terms and conditions as envisaged under Section 438(2) Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973.”

It has been stated by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has joined the investigation in pursuance of the interim directions issued by this Court and is no more required for custodial interrogation.

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

In these set of circumstances, sufficient exceptional circumstances are made out to extend the concession of pre-arrest bail to the petitioner. The order dated 02.07.2021 is made absolute.

The petition stands allowed.

08.10.2021
Janki

(VIVEK PURI)
JUDGE

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