

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

**CRM-M-26432-2016 (O&M)  
Date of Decision: 29.11.2018**

**BIKENDER @ VIKENDER**

... Petitioner

**Versus**

**STATE OF HARYANA**

...Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANITA CHAUDHRY**

Present: Mr. AK Goyal, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Ms. Mahima Yashpal, AAG, Haryana.

Ms. Promila Nain, Advocate  
for the complainant.

\*\*\*

**ANITA CHAUDHRY, J.(oral)**

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that the criminal proceedings initiated in the State of UP. have been quashed by the Allahabad High Court and they have paid the entire amount.

Learned counsel for the complainant says that the petition under Section 13-B of the Hindu Marriage Act has not been filed and the same has to be filed in Sonapat Courts.

This is agreed by the petitioner side. Counsel for the petitioner says that petition for mutual divorce would be filed within a fortnight.

Looking to all these circumstances, but without commenting on the merits of the case, the petition is allowed and order dated 03.08.2016 granting interim bail to the petitioner is made absolute subject to the conditions laid down in Section 438 Sub Section 2 Clauses (i)(ii) and (iii) of the Code of Criminal Procedure. The petitioner and the complainant would file petition under Section 13-B of the Hindu Marriage Act in the Sonapat Courts within a fortnight.

**(ANITA CHAUDHRY)  
JUDGE**

**November 29, 2018**

Sunil

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No