

207 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-54328-2021
Date of Decision: 22.03.2022

RAVI SINGH ... PETITIONER
V/S
STATE OF HARYANA ... RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIVEK PURI

Present: Mr. Abhimanyu Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Zorawar Singh Chauhan, DAG Haryana.

* * *

VIVEK PURI, J. (ORAL)

On 23.12.2021, following order was passed:

“Petitioner is seeking anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No. 315 dated 08.12.2021 under Sections 3 and 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961 and Section 406 of IPC 1860, registered at Police Station Lakhan Majra, District Rohtak, Haryana.

Briefly, the allegations in the FIR are to the effect that the marriage of the daughter of the complainant was proposed to be solemnized with the petitioner. At the first instance, the brothers-in-law of the petitioner raised a demand of Swift car and subsequently, the demand of Harrier car was raised. The father of the petitioner had raised a demand of jewellery articles. There is an allegation with regard to demand of Rs.5,00,000/- in cash, 10 Gold rings and a top-model Harrier car.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that there is no allegation with regard to the demand attributed to the petitioner who was the proposed bridegroom. At the time of ring ceremony and earlier rituals, a sum of about Rs. 2,50,000/- was spent by the parental side of the petitioner as depicted in Annexure P-1 and a sum of about Rs.1,09,000/- was spent by the family of the complainant as depicted in Annexure P-4.

It has been stated that only customary gifts were exchanged and no demand was raised.

Notice of motion.

Mr. Zorawar Singh Chauhan, DAG Haryana accepts notice on behalf of the State.

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.

Adjourned to 22.03.2022.”

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 Inspector Abdula Khan 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 23.12.2021 is made absolute.

The petition stands allowed.

(VIVEK PURI)
JUDGE

22.03.2022

Janki

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