IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM No.M-42698 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 05.04.2017

Sunita & another ... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab ... Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA.

Present:- Mr. Aseem Kataria, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Harpreet K. Athwal, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. A.K. Khunger, Advocate for the complainant.

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA, J.

CRM-11143-2017:

Application is allowed as prayed for. Compromise deed dated 14.02.2017 is taken on record as Annexure A-2.

Application is disposed of.

Main case:

This order shall dispose of the instant petition filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. seeking concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioners in case FIR No.89, dated 27.10.2016, under Sections 382/324/323/447/148/149 IPC (Section 307 and 325 IPC added subsequently), registered at Police Station Arniwala, District Fazilka.

While issuing notice of motion on 30.11.2016, the following order was passed by this Court:

"Petitioners are ladies who along with Jagmeet Singh had allegedly assaulted Meenu. Petitioner No.1 is alleged to have attacked Meenu with sota on the backside of her head whereas petitioner No.2 had inflicted injury with thapa on the right buttock of Meenu.

Counsel for the complainant Mr. A.K. Khunger has intervened to

Harjeet Kaur
2017.04.06 22:34
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

oppose the petition contending that the petitioners being members of unlawful assembly have assaulted and robbed complainant Meenu.

Heard. Taking into consideration the individual role of the petitioner, notice to Advocate General, Punjab, for December 23, 2016.

Meanwhile, an interim direction is issued that the petitioners will join investigation on December 10, 2016 and in case of their doing so, they will be released on interim bail to the satisfaction of the arresting officer.

Counsel for the complainant will be at liberty to raise arguments on next date of hearing."

Subsequently, on account of offence under Sections 307/325 IPC having been added, this Court had extended the interim protection even qua the added offences in the light of order dated 14.12.2016.

During the course of hearing today, counsel appearing for the petitioners would contend that a compromise has since been effected between the parties. In this regard, the compromise deed dated 14.02.2017 at Annexure P-2 is referred to.

Counsel appearing for the complainant also concedes to the factum of the compromise having been effected with the accused party. That apart, learned State counsel upon instructions from ASI Milakh Raj would apprise the Court that the petitioners have since joined investigation.

In view of the circumstances noticed hereinabove, prayer made in the present petition is accepted. Orders dated 30.11.2016 and 14.12.2016 passed by this Court are made absolute

Disposed of.

05.04.2017 **(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)**
harjeet **JUDGE**

i) Whether speaking/reasoned? Yes
ii) Whether reportable? No

Harjeet Kaur
2017.04.06 22:34
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document