

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

213-1

CRM-M-10295-2022

Date of Decision:12.10.2022

ANKIT

...PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

...RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUVIR SEHGAL

Present: Mr. S.S. Mor, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Mahima Yashpal, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Parveen Sharma, Advocate for the complainant.

SUVIR SEHGAL, J.(ORAL)

Vide the instant petition filed under Section 438 of Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, the petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case FIR No.515 dated 25.11.2021, Annexure P-1, registered under Sections 498-A, 406, 506, 354-A and 34 of IPC, 1860, however, Sections 354-A, 34 of IPC were deleted and Section 376 of IPC and Sections 27 and 30 of the Arms Act, 1959 were added later on, at Police Station Sadar Rohtak, District Rohtak.

Counsel for the petitioner submits that during the pendency of the petition, with the intervention of respectables, a *panchayati* compromise has been arrived at and in terms thereof, a petition seeking divorce by mutual consent has been instituted, first motion has been recorded and the entire permanent alimony of Rs.38 lac has been paid to the complainant.

Still further, he submits that the petitioner has joined the investigation in compliance of order dated 08.08.2022.

The factum of joining the investigation has been affirmed by the State counsel, upon instructions from L/ASI Rekha. She submits that although some recovery was effected from the petitioner, but the complainant has refused to accept the same. As per her instructions, petitioner is no longer required for custodial interrogation.

In view of the above, but without commenting upon the merit of the allegations levelled in the FIR, present petition is allowed and order dated 08.08.2022 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.

12.10.2022
sheetal

(SUVIR SEHGAL)
JUDGE

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