

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

**CRM-M-5359-2016 (O&M)
Date of decision: 25.07.2017**

Amarjit Kaur

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JAISHREE THAKUR

Present: Mr. M.K. Singla, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Abhay Pal Singh Gill, Asstt. A.G., Punjab.

Mr. Ashok Bhardwaj, Advocate,
for respondent No.2.

JAISHREE THAKUR, J. (ORAL)

The instant petition has been filed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No. 01 dated 07.01.2016, under Sections 498-A/406 IPC, registered at Police Station NRI Sangrur, District Sangrur.

A statement was made that the petitioner is ready to settle all disputes. The matter was taken up on 25.07.2016. A Coordinate Bench of this Court noticed that the son of the petitioner had not presented himself in Court to settle the dispute with his wife and another opportunity was granted to the petitioner to inform the Court as to when her son would come to India.

On 22.09.2016, another statement was made that the parties would be ready to settle the dispute out of the Court. Resultantly, the matter was referred to mediation. The matter did not culminate before the Mediation and the Coordinate Bench of this Court took up the matter on 22.02.2017, on which date learned counsel for the petitioner sought time to

get instructions regarding making of an FDR of Rs. 5 Lacs in the name of minor child, who was residing with the complainant.

On 28.03.2017, the petitioner was present in Court and stated that she would be ready to make an FDR of Rs. 5 lacs in the name of the minor child after the crop was harvested.

Despite several opportunities having been availed by the petitioner to get an FDR prepared in the name of the minor child, it appears that the same has not been done.

Learned counsel for the complainant submits that the son of the petitioner is working in New Zealand and is unable to travel on account of his passport having been impounded and she herself is unable to make out a fixed deposit in favour of the minor child.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties.

Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Varendra Kumar, submits that only part of the dowry articles have been recovered whereas 8 tolas of gold and Rs. 5 lacs is still with the family of the petitioner. Despite having made a categorical statement in Court on several occasions that the petitioner would furnish a fixed deposit of Rs. 5 lacs in the name of minor child, who happens to be her grand daughter, the same is not forthcoming. Prima facie, it would appear that the interim protection sought was on a false premise. The Court is not inclined to entertain this petition, which is hereby dismissed.

25.07.2017

Satyawan

**(JAISHREE THAKUR)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes
No.