

203.

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

CRM-M-39057-2019 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 01.10.2021

(Heard through VC)

HARPREET SINGH SEKHON

.... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

.... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JAISHREE THAKUR

Present:- Mr. Himmat Singh Deol, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Ms. Mahima Yashpal, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Manuj Nagrath, Advocate, for the complainant.

JAISHREE THAKUR.J (Oral)

The instant petition has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.60, dated 30.05.2019, registered under Sections 498-A, 323, 34 of IPC at Women Police Station, Ballabhgarh, Faridabad.

In brief, the facts are that the marriage was solemnized between the petitioner and the complainant on 09.02.2000 and out of this wedlock, a child, namely, Seerat Kaur, was born. However, on account of matrimonial differences that arose between the parties, the present FIR came to be registered. The petitioner, who was a resident of America, filed for divorce from the complainant in USA which divorce was allowed on 23.05.2005. As a counter-blast, the complainant herein lodged a complaint which was ultimately compromised and an FIR No.251, dated 06.07.2005 was quashed

by the High Court. There is other litigation pending *inter se* the parties where there is an allegation that the complainant and the daughter have forged documents and entered into the house of late father of the petitioner located at Sector 16, Faridabad (Haryana). The petitioner and the complainant are at loggerheads with each other and despite the court trying to reach an amicable settlement between them, it seems the same is not possible. There are also allegations that the maintenance has not been paid by the petitioner herein.

It appears that pursuant to the order dated 13.09.2019, the petitioner has joined investigation, but a contention is raised by counsel for the complainant that he is not cooperating with the investigation.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned State counsel as well as counsel for the complainant.

As the petitioner has joined investigation, this Court deems it appropriate to confirm the ad-interim bail granted to the petitioner vide order dated 13.09.2019, with a rider that he will not leave India without permission of the trial Court. Needless to say that the parties who are litigating may proceed to establish their claims in the litigations that they are contesting.

Petition stands disposed of accordingly.

Since the main petition itself has been disposed of, the pending application(s) if any, shall also stand disposed of.

01.10.2021

sanjeev

Whether speaking/reasoned:

Yes/No

Whether Reportable:

Yes/No

(JAISHREE THAKUR)
JUDGE