

**In the High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana
At Chandigarh**

CRM-M-16281-2020 (O&M)
Date of Decision:-2.7.2020

Mehak Kaur Kohli @ Mehak Arora

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Harneet Singh Oberoi, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Gaurav Garg Dhuriwala, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Nahush Jain, Advocate for respondent No.2.

*(the aforesaid presence is being recorded through video conferencing
since the proceedings are being conducted in Virtual Court)*

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J.(Oral)

1. The petitioner has approached this Court seeking grant of anticipatory bail in respect of a case registered vide FIR No.288 dated 23.12.2019 at Police Station Tripuri, Patiala under Section 346 of Indian Penal Code and Sections 75/79 of Juvenile Justice Care & Protection Act, 2015.
2. The FIR was lodged at the instance of Seema, wherein it has been alleged that she used to do household work for different families in their houses and that one of her daughter was working for the petitioner Mehak Kaur Kohli @ Mehak Arora and that she had not returned back from their house and that

she suspected that she may have been detained by some unknown person for doing household work.

3. It is the case of the prosecution that the complainant's daughter went missing on 21.12.2019 and was later recovered on 22.12.2019 and her statement was recorded before Child Welfare Committee, wherein she levelled allegations against the petitioner to the effect that she used to be given beatings by the petitioner. However, subsequently when her statement was recorded in terms of Section 164 Cr.P.C. by learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Patiala, she stated that no wrong had been committed by the petitioner.
4. The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that pursuant to directions issued by this Court on 26.6.2020 the petitioner has handed over a bank draft for an amount of ₹10,000/- to the complainant and that the matter has since been compromised.
5. Mr. Nahush Jain, Advocate representing the complainant has admitted that the complainant has received a bank draft of an amount of ₹10,000/- and has also stated that misunderstandings between the parties have been cleared and that the matter stands compromised and that the complainant has no objection in case the petitioner is granted bail.
6. In view of the aforestated position especially the fact that the matter is stated to have been amicably resolved, the petition is accepted and it is ordered that in the event of arrest, the petitioner be released on bail subject to her furnishing personal bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of Arresting/Investigating Officer. However, the petitioner shall join the investigation as and when called upon to do so and cooperate with the

Investigating Officer and shall also abide by the conditions as provided under Section 438 (2) Cr.P.C.

7.
- It is, however, clarified that in case the petitioner does not join investigation, the Investigating Officer/prosecution agency will be at liberty to seek the cancellation of order granting bail to the petitioner.

2.7.2020

pankaj

(Gurvinder Singh Gill)
Judge

Whether speaking /reasoned	Yes / No
Whether Reportable	Yes / No