

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

CRL. MISC. No.M-42998 OF 2016 (O&M)
DATE OF DECISION : 24th MAY, 2017

Seema & another

.... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana

.... Respondent

CRL. MISC. No. M-43737 OF 2016

Shakuntla Devi

.... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.... Respondent

CRL. MISC. No. M-44339 OF 2016

Dhruv Shaswat

.... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A. B. CHAUDHARI

* * * *

Present : Mr. Vishal Rattan Lamba, Advocate for
 Mr. Himmat Singh Deol, Advocate for the petitioner.
 Mr. Arjun Singh Yadav, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Rajinder Paul, Advocate for the complainant.

* * * *

A. B. CHAUDHARI, J. (ORAL)

The petitioners have filed these petitions under Section 438 Cr.P.C. seeking anticipatory bail in FIR No.369 dated 26.09.2016 registered under Sections 498-A, 406, 506, 323, 376, 377, 34 & 120-B IPC at Police Station Sadar Sonipat, District Sonipat.

Rule.

Heard forthwith with consent of learned counsel for the rival parties.

During the pendency of all these petitions the matter was referred to the Mediation and Conciliation Center of this Court, since the nature of the dispute was of matrimonial nature. Learned counsel for the petitioners and the complaint/complainant, who are present before this Court with their respective clients, are *ad idem* that the settlement/agreement has been arrived at before the Mediation Centre. Not only that they make further statement that the husband and wife have started residing together and thus have joined the company of each other. There should be no difficulty in accepting the settlement which has been arrived at between the parties in the mediation centre of this Court.

I have perused the settlement/agreement produced by the Centre on the file of this case. In the report there is settlement/agreement signed by all the concerned parties namely first party petitioner-husband and second party wife-Sangeeta and Kavita, sister-in-law of Sangeeta.

In view of the fact that the dispute has been settled out of the Court i.e. before the Mediation Centre and further fact that the dispute arising out of the matrimonial dispute, I think the settlement/agreement should be accepted and the same shall be part and parcel of the judgment. The settlement/agreement is marked as Mark X for identification. The settlement/agreement is running into four pages.

In the light of the above, following order is passed:

ORDER

- (i) CRL. MISC. No.M-42998 OF 2016, CRL. MISC. No. M-43737 OF 2016 & CRL. MISC. No. M-44339 OF 2016, are allowed.

- (ii) In the event of arrest, the petitioners in all the above petitions shall be released on *ad-interim* anticipatory bail in FIR No.369 dated 26.09.2016 registered under Sections 498-A, 406, 506, 323, 376, 377, 34 & 120-B IPC at Police Station Sadar Sonipat, District Sonipat, on furnishing of bail bonds amounting to ₹10,000/- with one surety each in the like amount to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer.
- (iii) The settlement/agreement Mark 'X' shall form part and parcel of this judgment and shall be binding on the parties.
- Disposed of accordingly.

24th MAY, 2017
'raj'

(A. B. CHAUDHARI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : *Yes* *No*

Whether Reportable : *Yes* *No*