

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

Criminal Misc. No.M- 5187 of 2017(O&M)

Date of Decision: October 13 , 2017.

Nachattar Singh and another PETITIONER (s)

Versus

State of Punjab and another RESPONDENT (s)

CORAM:- HON'BLE MRS.JUSTICE LISA GILL

Present: Mr. Ashok Khunger, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Saurav Khurana, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. S.S.Sidhu, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

1. Whether reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?
2. To be referred to the reporters or not?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest?

LISA GILL, J.

Prayer in this petition is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners in FIR No.4 dated 24.01.2017 under Sections 498A/406 IPC registered at Police Station Women Cell, Bathinda, District Bathinda.

It is informed that the matter, during the pendency of this petition, has been resolved between the parties. The petitioners' son and respondent No.2 decided to part ways and have filed a petition under Section 13B of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955. A part of the settled amount has been handed over to

respondent No.2 and the matter is listed before the concerned court on 28.02.2018 for recording their statements at second motion in the said proceedings.

Learned counsel for the State, on instructions from ASI Gurdeep Singh, verifies that the petitioners have joined investigation.

There are no allegations on behalf of the State that the petitioners are likely to abscond or that they are likely to dissuade the witnesses from deposing true facts in the Court, if released on bail.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances as above, particularly the settlement arrived between the parties, but without commenting upon or expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, this petition is allowed. In the event of arrest of the petitioners, they be released on bail to the satisfaction of Investigating Officer/Arresting Officer. The petitioners shall join investigation as and when required by the investigating agency besides comply with the conditions stipulated in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

It is clarified that none of the observations made hereinabove shall be construed to be a reflection on the merits of the case. The same are solely confined for the purpose of decision of the present petition.

However, liberty is afforded to respondent No.2 to move an appropriate application, in case the terms and conditions of settlement between the parties are not adhered to by the petitioners and their son.

October 13 , 2017.
'om'

(LISA GILL)
JUDGE

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