

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

**Crl. Misc. No. M-9471 of 2017
Date of decision : 20.03.2017**

Veena Goyal and anr.Petitioners
versus
Nirmala Devi and others ...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RITU BAHRI

Present: Mr. Arihant Jain, Advocate
for the petitioners.

RITU BAHRI, J. (Oral)

Prayer in this petition is for quashing of complaint No. 50 dated 22.07.2013 under Section 31 and 32 of Protection of Women From Domestic Violence Act, 2005, rule 15 of 2006 for enforcement of order dated 28.02.2012 and summoning order dated 23.02.2017.

Learned counsel submits that petitioners were not parties in the original complaint. Neither the petitioners nor their husbands tried to grab the property of Nirmala Devi. In fact, it was Rajesh Kumar who wanted to grab the entire property of Nirmala Devi.

This petition at this stage is being disposed of keeping in view the age of the petitioners and the fact that petitioner No. 1 is suffering from cancer.

In the meantime, the personal appearance of the petitioners is exempting before the trial Court, subject to the following conditions:- (i) petitioners shall be represented through counsel; (ii) shall not delay/stall the trial proceedings; (iii) shall not dispute their identity as an accused; (iv) shall have no objection if the prosecution evidence is recorded in their absence but in the presence of their counsel; (v) shall appear before the trial Court as and when required by the trial Court; and (vi) any other condition which the learned trial Court may impose.

Further the trial Court is directed to refer the matter to Mediation Centre at Sangrur for an amicable settlement.

20.03.2017

G Arora

**(RITU BAHRI)
JUDGE**

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>No</i>