

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

**Criminal Misc. No. M-36337 of 2018
Date of decision: 08.01.2019**

Suneh Lata (correct name Sunil Lata)

..Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE DAYA CHAUDHARY

Present: Dr. Payel Mehta, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Amit Mehta, Sr. DAG, Punjab
for the respondent-State.

Mr. Inderjit Sharma, Advocate for the complainant.

Daya Chaudhary, J. (oral)

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been implicated in the case being wife of main accused, namely, Munish Bhangotra. A specific affidavit has been filed before this Court stating therein that neither the petitioner has received any amount from the complainant nor any amount was deposited in her account. Learned counsel further submits that neither any promise was made nor amount was demanded whereas learned counsel for the complainant submits that similar allegations are there against both the accused. Learned counsel for the petitioner also submits that husband of the petitioner remained in custody for a period of one month and thereafter, he was released on regular bail. However, learned State counsel submits that the recovery has not been effected either from the petitioner or co-accused, who is her husband.

Since main accused, who is husband of the petitioner has been released on regular bail and neither any amount was paid to the petitioner nor deposited in her account as stated by her in the affidavit, interim order dated 05.09.2018 passed by this Court in favour of the petitioner is made absolute.

Petition is disposed of accordingly.

08.01.2019
neetu

(DAYA CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes

Whether Reportable

No