

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

101+207

**CRM-M-47943-2021 (O&M)
Date of decision: 03.03.2022**

Simarjit Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present : Mr. Vishal Thakur, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Luvinder Sofat, AAG, Punjab
for respondent No.1-State.

Mr. Gurmeet Singh, Advocate
for the applicant in CRM-7765-2022 and
CRM-7766-2022.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

CRM-7765-2022

For the reasons mentioned in the application, the same is allowed. The applicant is exempted from filing certified copies of Annexures R-2/1/T to R-2/3 and reply along with Annexures is taken on record subject to all just exceptions.

CRM-7766-2022

Prayer in the instant application is for impleading the applicant as respondent No.2.

Learned counsel for the petitioner and learned State counsel have no objection if the application is allowed.

In view of the reasons mentioned in the application and no objection from counsel opposite, the application is allowed and the applicant is impleaded as respondent No.2. Amended memo of parties

is taken on record.

CRM-M-47943-2021

The present petition has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.245 dated 27.10.2021 under Section 498-A IPC registered at Police Station Tanda, District Hoshiarpur.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that false and fabricated allegations have been levelled by the complainant against her husband i.e. the petitioner, of subjecting her to physical and mental harassment subsequent to their marriage and demanding a car in dowry. He further submits that in compliance of order dated 16.11.2021, the petitioner has joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency.

Learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for respondent No.2, on instructions from ASI Kuldeep Singh, does not dispute the factum of the petitioner having joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency. Learned State counsel on further instructions submits that the petitioner is not required for further investigation much less for his custodial interrogation.

However, learned counsel for respondent No.2 has opposed the prayer made by the petitioner by reiterating the allegations levelled in the FIR in question.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant material placed on record.

In the facts and circumstances as enumerated hereinabove coupled with the fact that the petitioner has joined investigation and is

not required by the investigating agency, the petition is allowed and interim order dated 16.11.2021, is made absolute subject to the conditions laid down in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

03.03.2022

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)

Vinay

JUDGE

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