

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH
(211-2)

CRM-M-13193-2022

Date of decision:- 17.10.2022

Tarsem Lal and others

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUVIR SEHGAL

Present:- Mr. Mahipal S. Yadav, Advocate for the petitioners.

Ms. Mahima Yashpal, DAG, Haryana for State-respondent No.1.

Mr. Mukesh K. Sharma, Advocate for the respondent No.2.

...

SUVIR SEHGAL, J. (Oral)

Instant petition has been filed under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 seeking anticipatory bail in case FIR No.67 dated 04.03.2022, registered for offences under Sections 323, 324, 354, 377, 406, 498-A, 506, 509 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, at Police Station City Pehowa, District Kurukshetra, Annexure P-1.

Counsel for the petitioners submits that FIR, Annexure P-1, which is an outcome of a matrimonial dispute, has been amicably settled before the Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court during the pendency of the instant petition. He submits that in deference to order dated 19.09.2022 passed by this Court, petitioners No.1 and 2, who are the parents-in-law, and petitioner No.3, who is the husband of complainant-respondent No.2, have joined the investigation.

The aforesaid fact has been verified by the State counsel upon instructions from L/ASI, Saroj Bala. She submits the complainant-respondent No.2 has refused to accept the dowry articles and the petitioners are no longer required for custodial interrogation.

In view of the above, but without commenting upon the allegations levelled in the FIR, present petition is allowed.

Order dated 19.09.2022 granting interim bail to the petitioners, is made absolute, subject to conditions laid down in Section 438 (2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

17.10.2022
Kamal

(SUVIR SEHGAL)
JUDGE

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