
Rainab and another vs. State of Punjab and others

Present: Mr. Parveen Dahiya, Advocate, for
Mr. SPS Tinna, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Mr. K.S. Pannu, D.A.G., Punjab.

This petition has been put up on account of the fact that vide order dated 15.05.2013, it had been directed in terms of an undertaking furnished by petitioner no. 2 on 03.05.2013, that he would make a fixed deposit in favour of petitioner no. 1 for a sum of Rs. 1,00,000/- initially, and thereafter, for another sum of Rs. 1,00,000/-.

Whereas the first sum of Rs. 1,00,000/- had been deposited, it was directed while disposing of the petition that the remaining amount of Rs. 1,00,000/- would be deposited within six months from 15.05.2013.

No report having been furnished with regard to any such deposit made, the matter had been put up for hearing on 28.02.2017, on which notice had been issued to petitioner no. 2, returnable today.

Today learned counsel for the petitioner is present along with both the petitioners, who are identified by him (counsel for the petitioners).

Upon query to petitioner no. 1, i.e. Rainab, in whose favour petitioner no. 2 was to deposit the second sum of Rs. 1,00,000/- also, she has stated that she does not insist upon the second sum of Rs. 1,00,000/- being deposited in her name.

Consequently, nothing further remains to be done and the paper-book be therefore consigned to record.

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

March 22, 2017