

**206 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH
(through video conferencing)**

CRM-M-29146-2020
Decided on : 10.11.2021

Suman

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana & anr.

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present : Mr. P.S.Chauhan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Tanushree Gupta, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. T.S.Dhull, Advocate
for the complainant.

Manjari Nehru Kaul, J.(Oral)

Prayer in the petition filed under Section 439(2) Cr.PC read with Section 482 Cr.PC for setting aside the order dated 24.08.2020 passed by Addl. Sessions Judge, Rewari vide which respondent No.2 has been granted the concession of anticipatory bail.

Vide order dated 09.12.2020, parties had been referred to Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court for exploring the possibilities of an amicable settlement. However, as per report received from the said Forum the parties failed to arrive at an amicable settlement.

The precise grievance of the petitioner is that the trial Court while passing the impugned order dated 24.08.2020 (Annexure P-3) fell into grave error while making the interim order dated 14.08.2020 passed by ADJ, Rewari absolute even though the investigating agency in their reply had apprised the Court that the recovery of all dowry articles had not been effected and there was a likelihood that respondent No.2 could pressurize

the witnesses during trial to depose in his favour. It was thus, urged by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the impugned order be set aside and the anticipatory bail granted to respondent No.2 in the aforementioned background be cancelled.

Heard learned counsel as well as perused the material available on record.

On a pointed query put to learned counsel as to whether there had been any breach of conditions which had been imposed upon respondent No.2 at the time of passing of the impugned order, he fairly replied in the negative.

In the circumstances, this Court would not be inclined to accept the prayer made by the counsel for the petitioner for cancellation of anticipatory bail granted to respondent No.2 vide order dated 24.08.2020 only on the ground of non-recovery of dowry articles. It cannot be over-emphasized that demand and entrustment of dowry as alleged in the FIR in question would be a matter to be adjudicated upon and appreciated during trial when both the parties would adduce their respective evidence.

Accordingly, present petition stands dismissed.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

10.11.2021
sonia

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