

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

(Sr. No. 202)

CRM-M No.11378 of 2022 (O&M)

Date of decision : 25.08.2022

Amit Kumar

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK SIBAL

Present : Mr. Vinod K. Kaushal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Navneet Singh, Senior DAG, Punjab.

Ms. Promila Nain, Advocate for respondent No.2.

* * *

DEEPAK SIBAL, J. (Oral)

The present petition has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for the grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No. 62 dated 05.08.2021 registered under Sections 406 and 498-A IPC at Police Station Women, District Police Commissionerate, Amritsar.

On 17.03.2022, this Court had passed the following order : -

“Learned counsel for the petitioner inter-alia contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the case on account of a matrimonial discord between the petitioner and his wife-complainant's daughter; the petitioner has no other criminal antecedents; the FIR in question contains vague allegations of demand of dowry; there is no medical evidence to support the allegations of

beating showing falsity in the same and that the petitioner is also ready and willing to join and cooperate with the investigation as and when called by the investigating agency.

Notice of motion.

Ms.Gunkirat Kaur, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State.

For arguments, adjourned to 25.08.2022.

In the meanwhile subject to the petitioner's joining investigation as and when called by the investigating agency as also abiding by the other conditions provided under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C, in the event of his arrest in FIR No.62, dated 05.08.2021, registered under Sections 406, 498-A IPC at Police Station Women, District Police Commissionerate, Amritsar, he shall be released on ad interim anticipatory bail to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer."

Learned State counsel submits that under the afore-quoted order passed by this Court, the petitioner has joined and cooperated with the investigation and that his custodial interrogation is not required by the State.

Learned counsel for the petitioner as also learned counsel for the complainant further submit that their respective clients have amicably resolved their dispute and in pursuance whereof Rs.3 lakh, which include a cheque of Rs.1 lakh paid in the Court today, has already been paid by the petitioner to the complainant. Further amount of Rs.1,25,000/- is required to be paid now.

After considering the submissions made on behalf of the petitioner in the afore-quoted order and the statement made on behalf of the

State as also because the petitioner and the complainant have compromised the matter, the interim order of this Court dated 17.03.2022, granting ad interim anticipatory bail to the petitioner is ordered to be made absolute.

25.08.2022

sunil yadav

**(DEEPAK SIBAL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes / No

Whether reportable : Yes / No