



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.29490 of 2024
Date of decision: 3rd July, 2024

Bhagwant Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Ritu Raj Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Shiva Khurmi, Asst. Advocate General, Punjab
for the respondent/State.

Mr. Naveen Sharma, Advocate for the complainant.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of bail under Section 438 Cr.P.C. in case FIR No.0016, dated 16.04.2024, under Section 306 of the IPC registered at Police Station Phool, District Bathinda.

2. On the last date of hearing, i.e. 06.06.2024, while noticing the following submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner, who is father-in-law of sister of the complainant, a Coordinate Bench of this Court had granted the concession of interim bail to the petitioner and asked him to join investigation.

“2.1 Learned counsel for the petitioner inter alia contends that the petitioner is the father-in-law of the daughter of the deceased-Naib Singh. He has been falsely implicated in this case.



2.2 It is further contended that the marriage of the daughter of the deceased was solemnized with the son of the petitioner in the year 2006. The victim was residing separately since the year 2009 in her own house. Even as per the contentions recorded in the FIR, there was a compromise which was reduced into writing on 15.05.2009 (Annexure P-2), as per which all the dowry articles were returned to the victim by her husband and by his family members. Harmeet Singh (husband of the daughter of the deceased) has been arrested. The petitioner is remotely connected with the affairs and matrimonial dispute inter se the daughter of the victim and her husband. The petitioner is ready to join the investigation. The petitioner has neither abetted nor instigated to commit suicide, as such, the provisions of Section 107 IPC are not attracted. It is further contended that there were temperamental difference inter se Sarabjit Kaur and her husband Harmeet Singh since 15.05.2009 and Sarabjit Kaur was separately residing in her parental house along with her children.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance of the order dated 06.06.2024, the petitioner has joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency.

4. Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Manjinder Singh, does not dispute the factum of the petitioner having joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency. He, on further instructions submits that the petitioner is not required for further investigation much less for his custodial interrogation.



5. In the circumstances, the petition is allowed and the interim order dated 06.06.2024 is made absolute subject to the conditions laid down in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C. Needless to say, in case the petitioner misuses the concession of bail granted to him, the State would be at liberty to seek cancellation of the bail granted to him.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

July 3, 2024
rps

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