

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH
(Through Video Conferencing)**

209

**CRM-M-30796-2021(O&M)
Decided on : 04.10.2021**

GOBIND SINGH

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

. . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

PRESENT: Mr. Anil Shankar, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Ms. Tanushree Gupta, DAG Haryana
assisted by ASI Omee.

Mr. Charanpal Singh Bangri, Advocate
for the complainant.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (Oral)

The present petition has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C., for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.66 dated 21.07.2021 under Sections 323, 354, 354(A) and 506 of the IPC registered at Women Police Station, District Ambala.

Vide order dated 04th April, 2021 this Court while making the following observations had directed the petitioner to join investigation.

“Learned counsel for the petitioner inter alia contends that the petitioner is a 70 years old man against whom false allegations have been levelled by his widowed daughter-in-law of indulging in inappropriate behaviour. He submits that the occurrence in question as per the contents of the FIR took

place on 12.07.2021 and prior to that no complaint was ever made by the complainant against her father-in-law. He further submits that the reason behind levelling false allegations against the petitioner was that a Will had been executed on 29.06.2021 wherein the petitioner had equally divided his property between his grandsons (son of the elder son and the complainant's son). It has also been contended that the complainant was unhappy on that account as she wanted that she and her son be given a major share in the property. He further submits that even otherwise a completely unbelievable version has been brought forth in the FIR in question as it is the admitted case that the petitioner and his wife are residing in the same house as that of the complainant and it could not be believed that petitioner would have indulged in such inappropriate behaviour in the presence of his wife.”

Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that in compliance of order dated 04th April, 2021, of this Court, the petitioner has joined investigation.

Learned State counsel on instructions from ASI Omee does not dispute the said fact and submits that the petitioner is not required for custodial interrogation.

Learned counsel for the complainant has however opposed the prayer and submissions made by the counsel opposite by urging that there were serious allegations levelled against the petitioner of keeping an evil eye upon the complainant and also trying to touch her inappropriately on a couple of occasions for which he does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail.

Heard and perused the material on record.

In the wake of the submissions made and instructions received

by the learned State counsel, the instant petition is allowed and interim order dated 04th August 2021 is made absolute subject to the conditions laid down in Section 438(2) CrPC.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

October 04, 2021
S.Sharma(syr)

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable:	Yes/No