

## Lalita and Another Vs State of Punjab

**Court:** High Court Of Punjab And Haryana At Chandigarh

**Date of Decision:** April 24, 2006

**Acts Referred:** Criminal Procedure Code, 1973 (CrPC) â€” Section 438  
Penal Code, 1860 (IPC) â€” Section 406

**Citation:** (2006) 18 CriminalCC 635

**Hon'ble Judges:** Baldev Singh, J

**Bench:** Single Bench

**Advocate:** Pankaj Bali, for the Appellant; Shalini Attri, A.A.G., Haryana, for the Respondent

**Final Decision:** Allowed

### Judgement

Baldev Singh, J.

Lalita and Satish Kumar Chandel, petitioners are the parents of Sanjeev Kumar, who was married with complainant Rajni

Devi on 25.2.2002. Rajni got this case registered under FIR No. 134 dated 4.2.2006 under Sections 406 and 498-A IPC at Police Station City

Karnal. The petitioners have moved this petition u/s 43 8 Cr.P.C. for granting them anticipatory bail.

2. It is contended by the learned counsel for the petitioners that the petitioners resided at Delhi while Rajni complainant and her husband Sanjeev

resided at Patiala. Sanjeev, the main accused has already been enlarged on regular bail. It is submitted by ASI Jaswant Singh, Police Station City

Karnal, who is assisting the AAG, Haryana that from Sanjeev Kumar all the dowry articles except ornaments were recovered. After a lapse of 4

years since the marriage, the petitioners are not expected to be interested in the dowry articles given by parents of Rajni to her husband Sanjeev. It

is a general tendency that the parents and relatives of the bride-groom are involved in matrimonial cases. The learned counsel for the petitioners

cites the cases of Paramjit Singh Yadav v. State of Haryana, 1990(2) RCR Cri 60 (P&H); Shekhar Pandey v. State, 2004(1) A.D.(Del) 142;

Manphool v. State of Haryana, 2000(1) RCR(Cri) 167 (P&H) and MAQSOODAN v. STATE OF HARYANA, (2002) 10 SCC 97) in support

of his contentions.

3. This petition is allowed and anticipatory bail is granted to both the petitioners. They shall continue to appear before the Investigating Officer as

and when called upon to do so and in the event of arrest, the petitioners would be admitted to interim anticipatory bail on their executing bonds to

the satisfaction of Investigating Officer.