

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

201

(Through Video Conferencing)

CRM-M-21376-2019 (O&M)

Date of decision: 05.01.2022

Vinay Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present : Mr. Ashit Malik, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Tanushree Gupta, DAG, Haryana
for the respondent-State.

Mr. L.K. Gollen, Advocate
for the complainant.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

The present petition has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.44 dated 12.04.2019 under Sections 354A, 498A, 506, 323 and 34 IPC registered at Police Station Women Jind, District Jind.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that it was essentially on account of a matrimonial dispute between the petitioner and his wife that the FIR in question came to be registered. He submits that totally false and concocted allegations were levelled against the petitioner of subjecting his wife i.e. the complainant to physical and mental harassment for not getting dowry as per his expectations. He further submits that despite earnest efforts having been made before the Mediation and Conciliation Center, the parties failed to arrive at an amicable settlement. It has also been submitted that in compliance of

order dated 07.09.2021, the petitioner has joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency.

Learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for the complainant on instructions does not dispute the factum of the petitioner having joined investigation.

Learned counsel appearing for the complainant, however, submits that the petitioner had played a fraud upon the complainant by concealing the factum of his previous marriages. He has thus, opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

Learned State counsel has, however, on instructions submitted that the petitioner cooperated with the investigating agency during investigation subsequent to the grant of interim bail and his further custodial interrogation is not required.

In view of the above, the petition is allowed and interim order dated 07.09.2021, is made absolute subject to the conditions laid down in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

05.01.2022

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)

Vinay

JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No