

CRM-M-25478-2015(O&M)

Date of Decision:14.12.2015

JASPREET SINGH

....PETITIONER

VS

STATE OF PUNJAB

....RESPONDENT

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI

Present: Mr.ADS Sukhija, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms.Amarjit Kaur Khurana, Addl.AG, Punjab.

Mr.Tejinder Pal Singh, Advocate
for the complainant.

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?
2. To be referred to the Reporters or not?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

AJAY TEWARI, J. (Oral)

This is a petition for anticipatory bail filed in case bearing FIR No. 61 dated 08.06.2015, under Sections 406, 498-A IPC, registered at Police Station Women Cell, Ludhiana.

Today at one stage with the intervention of learned counsel a settlement had been arrived at. The complainant had originally claimed that the petitioner should pay a sum of Rs. 10 lacs but in view of the adamance of the petitioner that it would not be possible for him to pay, she had scaled down to Rs. 8 lacs and when the petitioner expressed his inability to pay even this amount, she has accepted the offer of the petitioner to settle this dispute for an amount of Rs. 6 lacs. It had been agreed that the parties will file a petition for divorce by mutual consent and in lieu of this the petitioner would also be at liberty

to get this FIR cancelled on the basis of today's compromise. I proposed that the petitioner should pay a sum of Rs. 3 lacs on the date of first hearing and the remaining amount on the date of second hearing after six months and this would be as per his request to grant him a period of six months to make the payment. However, the petitioner again changed his stance and stated that he would not be in a position to make any payment on the date of first hearing and would only pay the total amount at the second hearing which is not acceptable to the complainant. This case has been coming up before me since 02.11.2015 and parties have appeared before me on 27.11.2015 and 05.12.2015. I have found that the petitioner is adopting most unreasonable and stubborn attitude and is trying to squeeze the complainant in making some kind of settlement with him and is using this interim bail order to further pressurise the complainant and abusing the process of law.

In the circumstances the petition is dismissed.

Since the main case has been decided, the Criminal Misc. Application, if any, also stands disposed of.

December 14, 2015
sunita

(AJAY TEWARI)
JUDGE