

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

CRM-M-11445-2018

Date of decision: 02.07.2018

Yashleen Nitara @ Anu

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JAISHREE THAKUR

Present: Mr.Surender Pal, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

JAISHREE THAKUR, J. (ORAL)

This is a petition that has been filed for cancellation of regular bail allowed to respondent No.2 by an order dated 16.10.2017.

In brief, the facts are that respondent No.2 herein is the father-in-law of the complainant-petitioner Yashleen Nitara @ Anu. A marriage was solemnized between Vikram Singh son of respondent No.2 and the petitioner herein in September, 2012. While residing abroad a rift arose between husband and wife, which resulted in registration of an FIR in India. A compromise was arrived at between the parties dated 17.02.2017, however, the terms of the compromise were not adhered to. In proceedings under FIR, respondent No.2 (father-in-law) approached this Court by way of **CRM-M-3550-2017** seeking grant of bail in anticipation of his arrest in FIR No. 80 dated 17.12.2016 under Sections 323, 342, 406, 498-A and 506 IPC,

registered at Women Police Station, Panchkula. During the pendency of the petition an effort was made for reconciliation between the parties which did not fructify and the said bail application was contested and ultimately the petition was dismissed by the High Court on 21.04.2017. After the dismissal of the bail application, respondent No.2 herein approached the Supreme Court by way of filing Special Leave to Appeal (Crl.) No. 4480/2017. However, the said SLP was dismissed. Thereafter, respondent No.2 herein was arrested and subsequently released on regular bail by order dated 16.10.2017.

The petitioner herein who is the complainant, seeks cancellation of the regular bail granted to respondent No.2 Karan Singh Saharan on the ground that his son Vikram Singh and husband of the complainant-petitioner herein is residing in Australia and is not facing trial and that the compromise that had been arrived at between them has not been given effect to.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and find that no ground is made out for cancellation of the regular bail that has been allowed to Karan Singh Saharan. The matter of the compromise was already before this Court which was taken note of while rejecting the bail application. Subsequent thereto respondent Karan Singh Saharan was arrested and released on regular bail and he is facing trial. Nothing has been brought on record to show that respondent No.2 Karan Singh Saharan has misused the terms & conditions set out by the order dated 16.10.2017 to warrant any interference by this Court.

Counsel for the petitioner herein contends that as on date no recovery has been made of the dowry articles. In this regard, it is the opinion of the Court that the regular bail cannot be cancelled only on account of recovery of dowry articles is yet to be made.

Dismissed.

02.07.2018

Satyawan

(JAISHREE THAKUR)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes.
No.