

IOIN-CRM-M No.17797 of 2013

Mohini and another

vs.

State of Haryana and others

Present : None for the petitioners.

Mr. Tanuj Sharma, Asstt. Advocate General, Haryana
for respondents No.1 to 3 assisted by
ASI Harminder Singh.

Seen the reply sent up by the Deputy Superintendent of
Police, Tauru (Mewat) along with statements of the original
petitioner No.1-Mohini as well as her mother (respondent No.5).

It transpires therefrom that after her marriage with
petitioner No.2, the petitioner No.1 is leading a happy married life,
and her parents now have no objection to the couple living
together.

The clause relating to deposit of a security amount of
Rs.50,000/- in the form of FDR, as can be seen from the earlier
order dated 27th May, 2013 was essentially a voluntarily offer on
behalf of petitioner No.2 in the form of an affidavit dated 27th May,
2013. But the order itself goes to show that at no point the Court
had directed the said petitioner to actually make any such deposit.

In any event as the dispute between the parties in
question appears to have been amicably resolved now, so there is

no further need for the said petitioner to make any deposit as earlier offered by him.

Accordingly, this IOIN in CRM-M No.17797 of 2013 stands disposed off.

November 07, 2017
Dpr

(SUDIP AHLUWALIA)
JUDGE