

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

CRM-M-45994-2021

Date of Decision: 14.01.2022

Pawan Kumar Verma

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIVEK PURI

Present: Mr. Ashok Kumar Malhotra, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Ms. Monika Jalota, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. J.S. Lalli, Advocate, for the complainant.

VIVEK PURI J. (ORAL)

The matter has been taken up through Video Conferencing due to Covid-19 pandemic.

On 02.11.2021, following order was passed:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner states that the marriage of the petitioner with the complainant was solemnized as back as on 17.9.1993 and two sons were born from the wedlock. Both sons have attained the age of majority and are working as Chartered Accountants. Even the petitioner and the complainant are jointly working as Cost Accountants. The primary grievance of the complainant is to the effect that the petitioner has solemnized second marriage during the subsistence of the first marriage and a child is also born. Furthermore, the proceedings for dissolution of marriage under Section 13 of Hindu Marriage Act and the Domestic Violence (Prevention and Protection) Act are also pending.

Notice of motion for 13.1.2022.

Ms. Ruchika Sabherwal, AAG Punjab accepts notice on behalf

of the State.

Mr. Jagjot Singh Lalli, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of the complainant and placed on record the Vakalat-nama.

The offence under Section 494 IPC is bailable. The marriage has been solemnized as back as in the year 1993.

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 parties assure that they will make sincere efforts for amicable settlement between the parties during the intervening period.”

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has joined investigation and despite efforts, matter could not be amicably settled.

On instructions of ASI Rajesh Kumar, learned State counsel states that the petitioner has joined investigation and his custodial interrogation is not required.

Accordingly the order dated 02.11.2021, vide which the petitioner was granted interim bail, is made absolute.

The petition stands allowed.

14.01.2022

Apurva

**(VIVEK PURI)
JUDGE**

1. Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
2. Whether reportable: Yes/No