

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

**Criminal Misc. No.M- 4643 of 2017(O&M)**

**Date of Decision: April 17 , 2018.**

Vaneet Arora

..... PETITIONER (s)

**Versus**

State of Punjab and another

..... RESPONDENT (s)

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MRS.JUSTICE LISA GILL**

Present: Ms. Jigyasa Tanwar, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Ms. Seena Mand, DAG, Punjab.

None for respondent No.2.

\*\*\*\*\*

1. Whether reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?
2. To be referred to the reporters or not?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest?

\*\*\*\*\*

**LISA GILL, J.**

Prayer in this petition is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.07 dated 18.01.2017 under Sections 406/498A IPC, registered at Police Station Women Cell, Ludhiana City.

Learned counsel for the petitioner informs that the matter has been amicably resolved between the parties. The terms and conditions thereof were reduced into writing on 19.01.2018. Settlement/agreement dated 19.01.2018 is attached with the file of this case. It is further informed that the petitioner and his wife, the complainant decided to part ways and petition under Section 13B of the

Hindu Marriage Act, 1955 has been filed by them. Their statements at first motion have been recorded in the said proceedings and part of the settled amount in terms of the agreement has been handed over to respondent No.2. The petitioner undertakes to abide by the terms and conditions of the settlement in letter and spirit. Moreover the petitioner, it is submitted, has joined investigation and he undertakes not misuse the concession of anticipatory bail, if afforded to him. Therefore, it is prayed that this petition be allowed.

It is noticed that on 19.01.2018 settlement/agreement dated 19.01.2018 was taken on record in the presence of Mr. K.S.Sidhu, Advocate for respondent No.2. None had appeared on behalf of respondent No.2 on the last date of hearing. Today again, there is no representation on behalf of respondent No.2.

Learned counsel for the State, on instructions from ASI Vipin Kumar, verifies that the petitioner has joined investigation and is not involved in any other criminal case. The factum of settlement between the parties is also verified.

There are no allegations on behalf of the State that the petitioner is likely to abscond or that he is likely to dissuade the witnesses from deposing true facts before the Court, if released on bail.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances as above but without commenting upon or expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, this petition is allowed. Consequently, order dated 16.02.2017 is made absolute.

However, liberty is afforded to respondent No.2 to move an appropriate application in case the terms and conditions of the settlement arrived

at between the parties are not carried out by the petitioner.

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.

April 17 , 2018.  
'om'

**( LISA GILL )**  
**JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No