

CRM-M No. 13450 of 2020
CRM-M No. 15654 of 2020

-1-

201 (2 cases)

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

CRM-M No. 13450 of 2020
Date of Decision: 19.08.2020

Gurdip Kaur and another

-Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab

-Respondent

CRM-M No. 15654 of 2020

Malak Singh @ Meet

-Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

-Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH

Present: Mr. G.S. Salana, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Mr. Ramandeep Sandhu, Sr. D.A.G., Punjab.

Mr. F.S. Virk, Advocate,
for the complainant.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J. (Oral)

The case has been taken up for hearing through
video-conferencing.

Vide this common order, CRM-M No. 13450 of 2020
titled 'Gurdip Kaur and another vs State of Punjab' and CRM-M

No. 15654 of 2020 titled 'Malak Singh @ Meet vs State of Punjab' are being decided.

Facts are being noticed from CRM-M No.13450 of 2020.

Petitioners seek grant of anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No.72 dated 25.03.2020 registered under Sections 420/406/120-B IPC and under Section 13 of Prevention of Human Smuggling Act at Police Station Patran, District Patiala.

Petitioner No.1 is mother of Malak Singh, who is a travel agent. Petitioner No.2 is brother of said Malak Singh. The complainant paid an amount of Rs.9.9 lacs on the assurance that he would be sent to Spain. The complainant was sent to Armenia by Malak Singh instead of sending him to Spain.

Petitioners are alleged to have refused to give guarantee of the amount to the complainant on the ground that petitioner No.1 had already dis-inherited her son Malak Singh since 25.04.2019. There is an understanding between the complainant and Malak Singh for an amount of Rs.4,90,000/-.

At the time of issuance of notice of motion on 01.06.2020, learned counsel for the petitioners contended that the aforesaid understanding is going to be materialized very soon. Interim protection was granted to the petitioners. Thereafter, on 21.07.2020, learned counsel for the petitioners

sought time in order to give effect to the compromise with the complainant whereby they have agreed to pay an amount of Rs.4,90,000/- to the complainant.

Learned counsel for the complainant also endorsed no objection to the aforesaid course, provided last opportunity is granted to the petitioners.

In the light of aforesaid understanding, last opportunity was given to the petitioners to give effect to the compromise. It was made clear that in case the compromise is not given effect by the adjourned date i.e. today, the interim order shall be vacated.

Today, learned counsel for the petitioners states that the needful in the context of compromise has not been done so far.

Faced with this situation, this Court has no alternative, but to dismiss the petition.

Ordered accordingly.

August 19, 2020
Jyoti Sharma

(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE

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