

208 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-27870-2022

Date of Decision: 25.08.2022

NARINDER SINGH DALAL ... PETITIONER
VS.
STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER .. RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIVEK PURI

Present : Mr. Munish Kumar Garg, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Zorawar Singh Chauhan, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

Mr. Ashish Pundir, Advocate, for respondent No.2.

VIVEK PURI, J.(ORAL)

On 04.07.2022, the following order was passed:-

“Through instant petition, the petitioner is seeking anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No.84 dated 28.04.2022 under Sections 120-B/313/323/377/406/498-A and 506 IPC, registered at Police Station Sector-20, District Panchkula.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the marriage of the petitioner was solemnized with the complainant on 27.09.2009. The allegations with regard to the offence under Section 313 IPC pertain to November, 2016. Subsequently, the complainant had conceived and a child was also born in January, 2018. The co-accused have been granted pre-arrest bail by the Court of Sessions. Furthermore, the matrimonial dispute has been amicably settled between the parties in terms of settlement/compromise contained at Annexure P-3 and a petition bearing CRM-M-27516-2022 for quashing of FIR on basis of compromise has also been instituted. Presently, the petitioner and complainant are residing together in the matrimonial house.

Notice of motion.

Mr. Zorawar Singh Chauhan, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.1-State. Mr. Ashish Pundir, Advocate, has appeared on behalf of respondent No.2, filed vakalatnama and admitted the fact of compromise.

Adjourned to 25.08.2022.

In the meanwhile, the petitioner is directed to join investigation and in the event of his arrest, he shall be released on interim bail to the satisfaction of the Investigating Officer/Arresting Officer subject to the conditions as envisaged under Section 438 (2) of Code of Criminal Procedure.”

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that in pursuance of interim directions issued by this Court, the petitioner has joined the investigation.

Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Lajwanti, has not assailed the aforesaid factual aspects and further contends that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required.

Keeping in view the entire circumstances, sufficient grounds are made out to extend the concession of pre-arrest bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, order dated 04.07.2022, vide which the petitioner has been granted interim bail, is made absolute.

Petition is allowed.

25.08.2022

smriti

(VIVEK PURI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether Reportable : Yes/No