

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

205/A

CRM-M-51459-2023(O&M)
Date of Decision: 18.04.2024

MANVENDRA SINGH

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE HARPREET KAUR JEEWAN

Present:- Mr. Ashok K. Sharma (Bhana), Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Amrik Singh Narwal, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Mayank Yadav, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

HARPREET KAUR JEEWAN, J.

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.0066 dated 05.07.2023 registered under Sections 323, 34, 406, 498-A, 506 IPC at Women Police Station Narnaul, District Mahendergarh.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that the FIR was registered at the instance of the complainant-respondent No.2 on account of a matrimonial dispute between the parties. He further contends that the petitioner had joined the investigation in pursuance to the order dated 08.02.2024 passed by this Court.

3. Perusal of the file indicates that as per order dated 08.11.2023, the

matter was referred to Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court to explore possibility of amicable settlement between the parties. Thereafter, as per order dated 08.02.2024, the petitioner-husband of the respondent No.2-complainant was granted interim bail and parties were again directed to appear before the Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court on 12.02.2024.

4. On 08.02.2024, this Court passed the following order:-

“Mr. Mayank Yadav, Advocate has filed his Memo of Appearance on behalf of respondent No.2 in Court, which is taken on record. Learned counsel for respondent No.2 contends that respondent No.2 could not receive a notice for appearance before the mediation centre and submits that she is ready to appear before the Mediation & Conciliation Centre of this Court.

The parties are directed to appear before the Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court on 12.02.2024.

Adjourned to 01.03.2024 for awaiting the report of the Mediator.

Power of Attorney on behalf of respondent No.2 be filed on or before the next date of hearing.

In the meanwhile, the petitioner is directed to join investigation within ten days and in the event of arrest, he shall be released on interim bail, to the satisfaction of the arresting officer/Area Magistrate, subject to furnishing bonds/surety, and also subject to the following conditions:-

(i) That the petitioner shall further make himself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required.

(ii) That the petitioner shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer.

(iii) That the petitioner shall not leave India without the prior permission of the Trial Court/CJM concerned.”

5. As per the report of the Mediator, Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court, the petitioner did not appear for mediation proceedings. However, both the parties are *ad idem* that matter has now been settled between the parties and matrimonial dispute *inter se* the petitioner-husband and respondent No.2-wife has been resolved.

6. Learned counsel for respondent No.2, who has filed his memo of appearance contends that both the parties have decided to file a joint petition for divorce under Section 13-B of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955 before the

Family Court.

7. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent-State on instructions from ASI Asha confirms that the petitioner has joined the investigation.
8. Keeping in view the reasons recorded in the order dated 08.02.2024 and keeping in view the fact that the petitioner has joined investigation; his custodial interrogation is not required by the Investigating Agency, the present petition is allowed and the order dated 08.02.2024 granting interim bail to the petitioner is made absolute, subject to the conditions laid down under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.
9. Nothing expressed hereinabove would be construed to be an expression of opinion on merits of the case.
10. All pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

(HARPREET KAUR JEEWAN)

JUDGE

18.04.2024

P.Bhatt	Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
	Whether reportable	Yes/No