

IN THE PUNJAB & HARYANA HIGH COURT AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-25005-2016  
Date of decision : 20.02.2017

Daya Nand

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

***CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH***

Present: Mr. Naresh Singh Shekhawat, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr.Sharad Kumar Yadav, DAG, Haryana.

Mr.Aditya Sanghi, Advocate  
for the complainant.

**AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J.(ORAL)**

Learned counsel for the petitioner has vehemently argued that the complainant had withdrawn her civil suit twice after a compromise reached between the parties, instead of getting the suit decreed in terms of the compromise. Thereafter, the petitioners' father died on 30.12.2012 after which the power of attorney in favour of the petitioner stood extinguished.

Having considered the aforesaid argument, though on “technical grounds” the learned counsel for the petitioner is correct, however, the fact that after entering into a compromise, the petitioner still did not execute any sale deed in favour of the respondents, would seem to reveal his mala fide intention. However, without commenting upon the

anticipatory bail, I do not find it an appropriate case to grant such concession to the petitioner.

Dismissed. The interim order dated 25.07.2016 stands vacated.

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)  
JUDGE

February 20, 2017.  
*Davinder Kumar*

|                             |        |
|-----------------------------|--------|
| Whether speaking / reasoned | Yes/No |
| Whether reportable          | Yes/No |