

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

Criminal Misc. No.M- 28749 of 2017 (O&M)

Date of decision : September 21, 2017

Jagdev Singh and another

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and another

....Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE LISA GILL

Present: Mr. Naresh Jain, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Devinder Bir Singh, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Manish Singh, Advocate
for respondent No. 2.

LISA GILL, J.

The petitioners, who are the parents-in-law of the complainant, pray for concession of anticipatory bail in FIR No. 102 dated 25.11.2016, under Sections 323, 498-A, 506 IPC and added Section 316 IPC and Section 3 / 4 / 5 of Domestic Violence Act, 2005, Police Station Sadar Patti, District Tarn Taran.

While issuing notice of motion, the contention noted on behalf of the petitioners, reads as under:-

“ Petitioners are the parents in-law of the complainant. It is submitted that the matter has since been amicably resolved between the parties. CRM-M-13512 of 2017 has been filed for quashing of the FIR No. 102 dated 25.11.2016, under Sections 323, 498-A, 506 IPC and added Section 316 IPC and Section 3 /4 / 5 of Domestic Violence Act, 2005, Police Station Sadar Patti, District Tarn Taran on the basis of the settlement.”

Learned counsel for respondent No. 2 verifies the factum of settlement between the parties. It is affirmed that respondent No. 2 is living alongwith her husband and in-laws in the matrimonial home. It is submitted that respondent No. 2 has no objection in case this petition is allowed in view of the position as above.

Learned counsel for the State verifies that the petitioners have joined investigation.

There are no allegations on behalf of the State that the petitioners are likely to abscond or that they are likely to dissuade the witnesses from deposing true facts in the Court, if released on bail.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances noted above but without expressing any opinion on the merits of case, it is considered just and expedient to allow this petition. Consequently, order dated 08.08.2017 is made absolute.

However, liberty is afforded to respondent No.2 to move an appropriate application in this matter, in case the terms and conditions of settlement between the parties are not adhered to by the petitioners.

September 21, 2017
rts

(Lisa Gill)
Judge

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No