

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

CRM-M-5026-2021 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 22.12.2021

Manjit Singh @ Mani @ Money

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Akbarjit Singh, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Ajay Pal Singh Gill, DAG, Punjab,
assisted by SI Sukjinder Singh.

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has approached this Court seeking grant of regular bail in a case registered vide FIR No.192, dated 31.10.2020, Police Station Division No.1, Jalandhar, under Sections 406, 420, 465, 467, 468, 471, 120-B IPC.
2. The FIR in question was lodged at the instance of Sita Rani, wherein it has been alleged that her husband had expired on 10.06.2015 in a vehicular accident and on account of which she had instituted a case seeking compensation in MACT, Jalandhar. Since the complainant

did not have much knowledge about the Court procedure, therefore, her Jija (brother-in-law) and her sister were pursuing the same. It is alleged that the said case came to be decided on 02.07.2018 and after the decision of the same, she opened a bank account on the asking of her brother-in-law Manjit Singh, so that she could get the compensation amount credited therein. The complainant was given a cheque book in respect of the said account. The complainant alleges that thereafter Manjit Singh asked her to hand over the cheque book to him so that he can use the same for withdrawing the money. Later, when the complainant went to the bank to get the pass-book updated, she came to know that on 06.02.2019, Manjit Singh in connivance with other accused i.e. his wife; the Branch Manager, Vijay Bank (now Bank of Baroda), Basti Sheikh Road, Jalandhar and the Branch Manager, Vijay Bank (now Bank of Baroda) Branch New Delhi had withdrawn an amount of Rs.3,83,000/- through a cheque. Although the complainant requested the petitioner and her husband to return the amount, but to no avail.

3. When the matter was taken up by this Court on 16.3.2021, it was represented that the petitioner wishes to settle the matter amicably as the complainant happens to be related to him. Consequently, the parties were directed to appear before DLSA, Jalandhar.
4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has today furnished a copy of compromise deed, stated to have been executed before Mediation and Conciliation Centre at Jalandhar.

5. Learned State counsel has however, feigned ignorance about the compromise.
6. Since, learned counsel for the petitioner has stated at bar that the matter has been amicably resolved as per compromise deed dated 23.4.2021, effected before Mediation and Conciliation Centre, Jalandhar and while also noticing that the parties are related *inter se*, the petition is accepted and the interim directions dated 16.3.2021 are hereby made absolute. The trial Court/Illaq Magistrate would however, be at liberty to impose any other condition, as deemed it fit so as to ensure the regular appearance of the petitioner before the trial Court.

22.12.2021

mohan

**(GURVINDER SINGH GILL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking /reasoned Yes / No

Whether Reportable Yes / No