

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

217

CRM-M-56975-2023

Date of Decision: December 15, 2023

Jaswant Singh

.....Petitioner(s)

Vs.

State of Punjab and another

.....Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIVEK PURI

Present: Mr. Deepak Arora, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Hittan Nehra, Addl. A.G. Punjab

Mr. Raman Mahajan, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

VIVEK PURI J. (ORAL)

1. On 14.11.2023, the following order was passed:-

“1. The petitioner is seeking anticipatory bail bearing FIR No.0109 dated 17.09.2023 under Sections 323, 341, 406, 498-A/34 IPC registered at PS Phase-11, District SAS Nagar.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the marriage of the son of the petitioner was solemnized with the complainant on 02.01.2018. The complainant is working as a Lecturer in MCM DAV College, Chandigarh. The matrimonial dispute has arisen out on account of temperamental differences between the couple. The allegations with regard to demand of dowry are false. Even, at the time of alleged beatings given by the husband of the complainant, the petitioner was away from the house. The allegation of the complainant is to the effect that the petitioner had been instigating her husband.

3. Notice of motion.

4. *Ms. Ruchika Sabharwal, DAG Punjab accepts notice on behalf of respondent-Sate.*
5. *Mr. Raman Mahajan, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of the complainant/respondent No.2.*
6. *Adjourned to 15.12.2023.*
7. *Meanwhile, it is directed that in the event of arrest, the petitioner be admitted on interim bail on furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer subject to the condition that he joins the investigation and comply with other conditions as specified under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.”*

2. As per report of the Mediator in the connected petition bearing CRM-M-58372-2023, despite best efforts, the parties could not reach at any amicable settlement.

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

4. Learned State counsel, on instructions, has not disputed the aforesaid factual aspects and further submits that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required.

5. Keeping in view the entire circumstances, sufficient grounds are made out to extend the concession of pre-arrest bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, order dated 14.11.2023, vide which the petitioner has been granted interim bail, is made absolute.

6. Petition is allowed.

(VIVEK PURI)
JUDGE

December 15, 2023
sonia arora

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