

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

**Date of Decision: 25.02.2022**  
**CRM-M-38192-2021**

**RASHMI** ... PETITIONER  
**VS.**  
**STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER** .. RESPONDENTS

**CRM-M-38198-2021**

TEENU ... PETITIONER  
VS.  
STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER .. RESPONDENTS

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIVEK PURI**

Present : Mr. Iqbal Singh Saggu, Advocate, for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Vikas Bhardwaj, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Amit Choudhary, Advocate, for the complainant.

\* \* \* \* \*

**VIVEK PURI, J.(ORAL)**

The matter has been taken up through video-conferencing due to COVID-19 pandemic.

On 15.09.2021, the following order was passed:-

*“Prayer in both these petitions is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner(s), who are sisters-in-law, i.e. sisters of the husband of the complainant. It is submitted that the marriage between the brother and the complainant was solemnized as far back as 2012, however, the married life was not smooth. In fact, the brother of the petitioner has already filed a petition under Section 13 of the Hindu Marriage Act in Sangrur as far back as in the year 2016 which now stands transferred to Fatehabad at the behest of the complainant herself. The instant FIR has been filed in the year 2021. Counsel would submit that the petitioners are ready to join investigation.*

*Notice of motion for 25.02.2022.*

*Meanwhile, the petitioners are directed to join the investigation within a period of one week and on their doing so, the petitioners be released on interim bail subject to their furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of Arresting/Investigating Officer. However, the petitioners shall continue to join the investigation as*

*and when called upon to do so and shall abide by the conditions as provided under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.*

*A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of connected case.”*

Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that the petitioners are the sisters-in-law of the complainant and in pursuance of interim directions issued by this Court, they have joined the investigation

Learned State counsel has not assailed the aforesaid factual aspect(s) of the matter and has stated that the petitioners have joined the investigation and their custodial interrogation is not required.

However, learned for respondent No.2/complainant states that recovery is yet to be effected.

It may be mentioned here that the petitioners are the sisters-in-law of the complainant, they have joined the investigation in pursuance of interim directions issued by this Court and there is a categorical stand of the learned State counsel that their custodial interrogation is not required.

Keeping in view the above, sufficient grounds are made out to extend the concession of pre-arrest bail to the petitioners. Accordingly, order dated 15.09.2021, vide which the petitioners have been granted interim bail, is made absolute.

Both the petitions are allowed.

25.02.2022  
smriti

(VIVEK PURI)  
JUDGE

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