

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

CRM-M-7936-2016

Date of decision: 06.07.2017

Amrik Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JAISHREE THAKUR

Present: Mr. Harinder Singh, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. N.K. Banka, DAG, Punjab.

JAISHREE THAKUR, J. (ORAL)

The instant petition has been filed for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No. 18 dated 13.01.2016 under Sections 494 and 498-A IPC, registered at Police Station City Barnala, District Barnala.

The matter was taken up on 11.03.2016, wherein it had been contended that *“the present FIR was registered due to some misunderstanding between the parties and now the matter has been compromised. Learned counsel further contends that at present the complainant is residing with her parents in law, who have already been granted concession of interim anticipatory bail”*. On the statement made under instructions, anticipatory bail was allowed to the petitioner by order dated 11.03.2016.

Thereafter appearances were put in by the parties. During the course of the proceedings, it has been brought to the notice of the Court that

the petitioner has got married with one Manpreet Kaur on 4.11.2015. Learned counsel for the complainant as well as counsel for the State urged that the interim protection was granted on a false statement being made in Court. In fact, the compromise that had been entered between the parties was dated 09.11.2015 whereas the current FIR had been lodged thereafter and there was no compromise between the parties. The petitioner also made a statement in Court that he would be ready to transfer one shop in the name of the complainant to secure the future of the minor child and the rent of the said shop would be ₹ 20-25,000/- per month. This statement was made before a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court on 14.12.2016. By the same order, the petitioner was directed to give a sum of ₹ 25,000/- before the Mediation Centre of this Court to the complainant towards litigation expenses. This Court is informed that the said amount has not been paid as on date. Learned counsel for the petitioner is not able to dispute this fact that litigation expenses have not been paid. This Court is also informed that the petitioner has been implicated in another FIR No. 55 dated 14.07.2015 under Sections 307, 354, 341, 323, 427, 506, 148, 149 IPC and Section 27 of the Arms Act, registered at Police Station Rureke Kalan.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and in view of the fact that the very interim order was obtained by misleading this Court that the parties had compromised and that the complainant was residing with the parents-in-law i.e. parents of the petitioner, this Court is not inclined to entertain this petition. It is well settled that anyone seeking relief is bound to approach this Court with clean hands which is miserably lacking in the instant petition.

The petition stands dismissed.

06.07.2017

Satyawan

(JAISHREE THAKUR)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes.
No.