

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

CRM-M-44476 of 2016 (O&M)

Date of Decision:25.01.2018

Darshana Rani

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

AND

CRM-M-44791 of 2016 (O&M)

Darshan Lal Batra

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent.

AND

CRM-M-45131 of 2016 (O&M)

Navdeep Kumar

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MRS.JUSTICE LISA GILL

Present: Mr. O.P.Kamboj, Advocate and
Ms. Anshika Sharma, Advocate
for Mr. Salil Bali, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Ms. Monika Jalota, DAG, Punjab.

LISA GILL, J(Oral).

This order shall dispose of CRM-M-44476 of 2016 and CRM-M-44791 of 2016 and CRM-M-45131 of 2016. For the sake of convenience, facts are extracted from CRM-M-44476 of 2016.

Petitioners seeks the concession of anticipatory bail in FIR No.70 dated 21.06.2016, under Sections 498-A, 354, 323, 120-B IPC (Section 406 IPC added later on), registered at Police Station City Jalalabad,

District Fazilka.

It is submitted that during the pendency of these petitions, the matter has been amicably resolved between the parties. Petitioner-Navdeep Kumar and the complainant have resumed matrimonial ties. They are living together alongwith their minor child.

Petitioner-Navdeep Kumar and the complainant-Nishu Bala, duly identified by their counsel are present in Court. It is submitted that both of them have indeed resumed cohabitation. They are living with each other. The complainant, states that she has no objection in case all these petitions are allowed subject to her being afforded proper care and affection in the matrimonial home.

Petitioner-Navdeep Kumar, present in Court, undertakes that he shall provide all amenities to his wife, the complainant as well as the minor child.

Learned counsel for the State, on instructions from ASI Bhajan Singh, verifies that all the petitioners have joined investigation and they are not involved in any other criminal case. There are no allegations on behalf of the State that the petitioners are likely to abscond or influence witnesses in any manner.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances as above, specifically the resumption of matrimonial ties between the parties, but without commenting upon or expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, these petitions are allowed. Consequently, orders dated 16.12.2016 in CRM-M-44476 & 44791 of 2016 and order dated 17.12.2016 in CRM-M-45131 of 2016, are made absolute.

A sum of ₹30,000/- directed to be deposited in CRM-M-44791 of 2016, to be paid as litigation expenses to respondent no.2, be released to

the complainant-respondent no.2 *qua* adequate proof of identity.

It is clarified that none of the observations made hereinabove shall be construed to be a reflection on the merits of the case. The same are solely confined for the purpose of decision of the present petition.

25.01.2018
s.khan

[LISA GILL]
Judge

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No.
Whether reportable : Yes/No.