

203

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

(1)

CRM-M-40456-2016

Date of Decision : 27.07.2017

Vijay Lakshmi

.....Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab

....Respondent

(2)

CRM-M-40909-2016

Date of Decision : 27.07.2017

Rohit

.....Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab

....Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE LISA GILL

Present: Mr. Alok Mittal, Advocate for
Mr. Chandandeep, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Monika Jalota, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Prashant Vashisht, Advocate
for the complainant.

LISA GILL, JUDGE (ORAL)

This order shall dispose of CRM-M-40456-2016 (Vijay
Lakshmi versus State of Punjab) and CRM-M-40909-2016 (Rohit versus
State of Punjab).

The petitioners in both the petitions seek the concession of

anticipatory bail in FIR No. 68 dated 03.06.2016 under Sections 406/498-A IPC registered at Police Station Women Cell, District Jalandhar.

The petitioners-Rohit and Vijay Lakshmi, are husband and mother-in-law of the complainant, respectively. It is submitted that during the pendency of these petitions, the matter has been amicably resolved between the parties before the Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this court on 05.04.2017. The terms and conditions of the settlement are attached with the file of this case. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that a petition under Section 13-B of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955 has been filed. A bank draft for a sum of Rs.2,50,000/- as per the agreement has been handed over to the complainant and rest of the agreed amount shall be handed over to her at the time of recording of statements of the parties at second motion.

Learned State counsel does not dispute the factum of settlement between the parties. It is further affirmed that the petitioners have since joined investigation. No recovery is to be effected from them. Their custodial interrogation is not required.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case as above, specifically the settlement dated 05.04.2017 arrived at between the parties, it is considered just and expedient to allow these petitions.

Consequently, order dated 17.11.2016 passed in CRM-M-40909-2016 and order dated 11.11.2016 passed in CRM-M-40456-2016 are made absolute.

However, liberty is afforded to the complainant to move an appropriate application in case the petitioners do not adhere to the terms and

conditions of the settlement.

(LISA GILL)
JUDGE

27.07.2017
Neha

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether reportable:	Yes/No