

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-55704-2019 (O&M)
Date of decision: 12.01.2022

Rama Kant Sharma

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

Present: Mr. M.K. Sood, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Deepak Grewal, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Vishal Yadav, Advocate
for the complainant.

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J. (ORAL)

Prayer in this petition is for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.611 dated 22.11.2019 under Sections 419/420 IPC, registered at Police Station Ballabgarh Sadar, District Faridabad.

While granting interim bail to the petitioner, following order was passed by this Court on 06.01.2020: -

“...Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that vide compromise deed dated 6.10.2018, it was agreed between the petitioner and complainant Komal that the complainant and

her daughter Adhira shall be kept in the house as family members and the petitioner will take care of them. The said compromise was entered in a criminal case lodged by the complainant i.e. FIR No.842 dated 7.9.2018 under Sections 120-B, 323, 368, 376, 420, 467, 468, 471, 506 IPC and Section 3 of the SC/ST Act registered at Police Station City Ballabgarh. After investigation of the aforesaid case, the police filed cancellation report before the Illaqa Magistrate, Faridabad. In a quashing petition, the police has made the aforesaid statement. Resultantly, the quashing petition was dismissed as withdrawn.

In the present case, the allegation is that the petitioner has got the name of his wife recorded in the record of death and birth as mother of the child born to the complainant. Learned counsel for the petitioner further contends that the aforesaid exercise was done for ultimate benefit of the child...”

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in pursuance of the aforesaid order, the petitioner has joined the investigation and is not required for any further investigation. It is further submitted that there is no allegation against the petitioner that for a period of two years, he has misused the concession of interim anticipatory bail in any manner.

Learned State counsel, assisted by learned counsel for the complainant, has not disputed the factual position and states that the petitioner is no more required for any further investigation.

In view of the above, this petition is allowed and the interim bail granted to the petitioner vide order dated 06.01.2020 is made absolute subject to the conditions envisaged under Section 438 (2) Cr.P.C.

[ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN]
JUDGE

12.01.2022
vishnu

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether Reportable : Yes/No