

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

Crl. Misc. M-16469 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of Decision: September 15, 2017

Ashok Sindhvani and another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and another

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JAISHREE THAKUR

Present:- Mr. Akashdeep Singh, Advocate
for the petitioners with Mr. Yogesh Sindhwai.

Mr. P.P. Chahar, DAG Haryana.

Mr. D.K. Tuteja, Advocate
for respondent No.2-complainant.

JAISHREE THAKUR, J. (Oral)

This petition has been filed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners in FIR No.236 dated 15.03.2016, under Sections 498-A, 406 of Indian Penal Code, registered at Police Station Rohtak City, District Rohtak.

During the proceedings of this case, the matter was referred for mediation, in which proceedings both respondent No.2-complainant and her husband Yogesh Sindhvani i.e. son of the petitioners were directed to be present. However, the mediation was not successful and the matter was

referred back to this court. On 05.07.2017, this court tried to intervene and effect reconciliation between the parties and thereafter an offer had been made by the son of the petitioners to bring a sum of Rs.2,10,000/- as against the value of the gold ornaments given to the petitioners by way of demand draft in the name of Registrar of this court. It was also noted by this court that counsel for respondent No.2-complainant submitted that the entire gold ornaments that were handed over at the time of wedding would be valued Rs.12,00,000/-. After the order was passed, the matter was adjourned to 11.08.2017, on which date an application bearing CRM No.24264 of 2017 was moved for recalling of the order dated 05.07.2017.

Today, the matter is taken up for hearing and a reply on behalf of respondent No.2-complainant has been filed to the said application that was preferred.

The application bearing CRM No.24264 of 2017 is moved for recalling of the order, whereby an offer to make payment of Rs.2,10,000/- as against the value of the gold ornaments is sought to be withdrawn.

I have heard counsel for the parties and this court is not inclined to allow recalling of the order so passed, since the said order was passed after due deliberations by this court in consultation and after having interacted with the son of the petitioners namely Yogesh Sindhwani and respondent No.2-complainant, who were present in the court.

At this stage, son of the petitioners has instructed the counsel of his parents that the petition should not be pressed.

A request is made by counsel for the petitioners, on instructions from their son to withdraw the instant petition, which is not opposed by

counsel for respondent No.2-complainant.

Dismissed as withdrawn.

September 15, 2017
vijay saini

(JAISHREE THAKUR)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No