

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

208

CRM-M-7143-2022

Date of decision: 02.08.2022

Ravinder Singh

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUVIR SEHGAL

Present: Mr. Manish Kumar Singla, Advocate with
Ms. Shikha Singla, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Amandeep Singh Gill, Senior DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Ishmeet Singh, Advocate for the complainant.

SUVIR SEHGAL J. (ORAL)

On 21.02.2022, this Court passed the following order:-

*“Prayer in the present petition under
Section 438 Cr.P.C for grant of anticipatory bail
to the petitioner in case FIR No.01 dated
20.01.2022 under Sections 498-A, 406 IPC
registered at Police Station Women, Malerkotla.*

*Learned counsel for the petitioner
inter alia contends that one year prior to the
registration of FIR in question, the complainant
had filed a complaint levelling similar
allegations to the Sr. Superintendent of Police,
Sangrur, who in turn marked enquiry to DSP,
Ahmedgarh. During inquiry, the police did not
find any substance in the allegations levelled, as
a result of which, the complaint moved by the*

complainant was filed on 09.05.2021. Learned counsel submits that after Malerkotla was made a district, complainant moved another complaint levelling same allegations, which led to the registration of FIR in question. He further submits that it was essentially on account of a marital discord between the parties that the FIR in question came to be registered.

Notice of motion for 27.07.2022.

Meanwhile, the petitioner is directed to join the investigation and appear before the investigating agency as and when called upon to do so. 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) Cr.P.C.”

Upon instructions from ASI Harpreet Singh, State counsel submits that the petitioner has joined the investigation and except two gold rings weighing approximately 1 tola, all the recovery has been effected and he is no longer required for custodial interrogation.

Counsel for the complainant has, however, disputed this fact and submits that no recovery has been effected from the petitioner.

Heard.

Non-recovery of disputed dowry articles cannot be an obstacle in the confirmation of the interim order passed in favour of the petitioner.

In view of the said facts, without commenting on the merits of the case, present petition is allowed and the order dated 21.02.2022

granting interim bail to the petitioner is made absolute, subject to the conditions laid down in Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

02.08.2022

pooja saini

(SUVIR SEHGAL)

JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No