

**IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND
HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH**

Crl. Misc. M 20703 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of decision: 17.10.2016

Shobha Bajaj and others

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and another

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JAISHREE THAKUR

Present: Mr. Prateek Pandit, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Anmol Malik, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Sanjeev Sharma, Advocate,
for respondent No.2.

JAISHREE THAKUR, J. (Oral)

The instant petition has been filed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners in FIR No. 27 dated 22.1.2016 under Sections 498-A, 406 and 506 IPC registered at Police Station Kotwali, District Faridabad.

During the pendency of the petition in this Court, learned counsel for the petitioners made an offer that the matter should be referred to Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent No.2 had no objection in case the matter was referred and subsequent thereto, the parties with the assistance of the Mediator arrived at an amicable solution, resolving their disputes and

differences. It was agreed that the complainant/wife would join her husband in Amrica and the husband would undertake to provide all necessary visa documents along with air tickets in order to help his wife to do so. This Court is informed that after the orders passed by the Mediator, the complainant has already joined the company of her husband and is happily settled with him.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the complainant, on instructions received from her father, who is present in Court and is a General Power of Attorney (GPA) of the complainant, submits that he would have no objection in case FIR so filed is quashed and set aside.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have also perused the settlement that has been arrived at between the parties. Taking note of the same and finding that the respondent/complainant has already joined the company of her husband, this court is of the opinion that no useful purpose would be served in not allowing the petition and granting anticipatory bail.

It is also noted that though this petition is for anticipatory bail in the FIR, one of the terms mentioned in the compromise arrived at between the parties is that the GPA i.e. father of the complainant, would withdraw the FIR in question and would also withdraw other cases as filed against the petitioners.

In view of the fact that the GPA, who is present in Court today, categorically submits that he has no objection in case the FIR is quashed, I

am of the view that it would be in the interest of justice if the FIR is quashed, particularly when the matrimonial dispute has been amicably settled and this would also avoid multiplicity of litigation.

Consequently, this petition for anticipatory bail is allowed. Further while exercising the power under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure Code and in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Gian Singh Versus State of Punjab and another 2012 (4) RCR (Cr.) 543, FIR No. 27 dated 22.1.2016 under Sections 498-A, 406 and 506 IPC registered at Police Station Kotwali, District Faridabad, is also quashed.

17.10.2016
prem

(JAISHREE THAKUR)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether reportable	No