

208 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-43935-2021
Date of Decision: 21.03.2022

AKSH SINGLA ... PETITIONER
STATE OF HARYANA V/S ... RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIVEK PURI

Present: Mr. Armaan Gagneja, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Zorawar Singh Chauhan, DAG Haryana.

(The case has been taken up through video conferencing on account of Covid-19 pandemic)

* * *

VIVEK PURI, J. (ORAL)

Petitioner is seeking anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No. 67 dated 08.09.2021 under Sections 498-A/323/506/406 IPC, registered at Police Station Mansa Devi Complex, District Panchkula, Haryana.

On 19.10.2021, notice of motion was issued and the arrest of the petitioner was stayed.

Subsequently, on 10.01.2022 following order was passed:

“Learned State counsel has pointed out that reply has already been submitted in the Registry and there is no direction issued in the instant case to the petitioner to join the investigation though his arrest has been stayed. Furthermore, the reply stated to have been submitted in the Registry has not been attached with the record of the case.

On October 19, 2021, it was submitted that the learned Addl. Sessions Judge, Panchkula had directed the police to give at least advance 3 days notice prior to the arrest of the petitioner, the

police had issued a written notice and they went upon to arrest him.

It was further submitted on behalf of the petitioner that it was a matrimonial dispute wherein counsel has specific instructions to submit that entire *istridhan* has been returned back to the complainant and arrest of the petitioner is sought to be effected to pressurize him to enter into a compromise.

Adjourned to 21.03.2022.

Meanwhile, the petitioner shall join the investigation and would come present as and when called for and in the event of arrest, the petitioner shall be admitted to interim bail on his furnishing personal and surety bonds to the satisfaction of Arresting/Investigating Officer. The petitioner shall also abide by the conditions as specified under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C. ”

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

Learned State counsel on the instructions of ASI Saraswati has pointed out that the petitioner has joined the investigation and is no more required for custodial interrogation.

In these set of circumstances, sufficient exceptional circumstances are made out to extend the concession of pre-arrest bail to the petitioner. The order dated 10.01.2022 is made absolute.

The petition stands allowed.

21.03.2022

Janki

(VIVEK PURI)
JUDGE

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