

Crl. Misc. No.M-39058 of 2018 (O&M)

1

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

**Crl. Misc. No.M-39058 of 2018 (O&M)
Date of decision : 19.09.2018**

Anuradha

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANITA CHAUDHRY

Present: Petitioner in person with
Mr. Kamal Chaudhary, Advocate.

ANITA CHAUDHRY, J(ORAL)

The petitioner has assailed the order vide which respondents no.2 & 3 the mother-in-law and the father-in-law have been permitted to travel abroad.

The petitioner was asked to be present in person and also bring her passport. The passport has been seen.

The petitioner fears that respondents no.2 & 3 who have been permitted to go abroad will not return to the country. In order to examine the allegations against them the petitioner was asked to give some details. According to her, the petitioner had stayed with the in-laws for about a fortnight in India before she left with them and went abroad and they were together for almost a year. Admittedly, no complaint was given against them abroad. The petitioner and respondents no.2 & 3 returned to country together.

Crl. Misc. No.M-39058 of 2018 (O&M)

2

Few days later, the petitioner flew back and has been travelling to Singapore, Malaysia and Indonesia. The trial Court had permitted respondents no.2 & 3 to go abroad from 24.08.2018 to 23.12.2018. It was noted that the case was fixed for prosecution evidence in January 2019, therefore, permission was given only up to 23.12.2018. They were also ordered to furnish personal and surety bonds in the sum of Rs.10 lacs each. Respondents no.2 & 3 had also placed on record the air tickets.

The petitioner fears that respondents no.2 & 3 will not return and made an attempt to urge that the copy of the tickets had not been placed on record and they were not even sure whether they were actual tickets. A perusal of the order shows that a copy of the air tickets had been produced and it is so noted in the order. The trial Court made note of the earlier application and the order passed on it and had also dealt with the change in the circumstances and passed a reasoned order allowing respondents no.2 & 3 to travel abroad.

At the close of the arguments, it was also submitted that respondents no.2 & 3 had already left the country.

In view of this, it is not necessary to refer to the submissions, the petition becomes infructuous and is dismissed.

19.09.2018
sunil

(ANITA CHAUDHRY)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No