

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-10952-2019

Date of Decision: 30.09.2019

Harmohinder Kaur

.....Petitioner

Vs.

UT Chandigarh

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present: None for the petitioner
Mr.Pawandeep Singh, Advocate,
for the complainant

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J. (ORAL)

By this petition, the petitioner seeks the concession of anticipatory bail, upon FIR no.429 having been registered against her on 10.12.2018 at Police Station Sector 36, Chandigarh, alleging therein the commission of offences punishable under Sections 406/420/120-B of the IPC.

On 19.3.2019, at the time when notice of motion was issued in the petition, counsel for the petitioner had handed over a bank draft for an amount of Rs.20.00 lakhs to the complainant, who was present in Court (as recorded in that order), with the petitioner therefore having been admitted to anticipatory bail, as an interim measure.

Thereafter, on 11.4.2019, though it was recorded that there seemed to be no chance of a compromise between the parties, however, but on the request of learned counsel for the petitioner, the matter had been adjourned to 6.5.2019, with the interim order continued.

Thereafter on 6.5.2019, on a joint request made, the petition had again been adjourned to 9.7.2019, on which date the turn not having come up, it was adjourned to 24.7.2019, with the following order passed on that date:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner, as also learned counsel for the complainant, submit that the matter has been compromised between the petitioner, Harmohinder Kaur and the complainant, Tarlochan Singh, though “modalities of the compromise” are still being ironed.

In view of the above, adjourned to 27.08.2019.

To be shown in the urgent list.”

On 27.8.2019, Rs.10.00 lakhs was agreed to be paid by the petitioner to the complainant on 30.8.2019, with the petition therefore adjourned to 5.9.2019.

On that date, none had appeared for the petitioner, but learned counsel for the complainant had still submitted that there being a possibility that the petitioner may pay the complainant the amount within the next few days, the matter may be adjourned. It was therefore adjourned till today.

Today again none is present for the petitioner for the second time in succession, with learned counsel for the complainant submitting that the money has not been paid.

Consequently, without making any comment on the actual merits of the case, I see no reason to continue this petition, which is consequently dismissed, with the interim order dated 19.03.2019 vacated.

September 30, 2019
pk/nitin

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes
No.