

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

CRM-M-3591-2020

Date of decision : 02.11.2021

Pawan Kumar

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Ms. Manjit Kaur, Advocate for
Mr. Satnam Singh Gill, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Amarjit Kaur Khurana, DAG, Punjab,

Mr. Ritesh Pandey, Advocate for the complainant.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

Petitioner has preferred the instant petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C., for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.103 dated 08.10.2019, under Sections 498A/ 406, 323 and 34 of the IPC, registered at Police Station Kalanaur, District Gurdaspur.

Vide order dated 28.01.2020, the parties were directed to appear before the Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court and the arrest of the petitioner was stayed and thereafter, the interim order was continued and on 06.08.2021 again the parties were directed to appear before the Mediation and Conciliation Centre, Gurdaspur on 20.08.2021. It was further ordered to the petitioner to pay Rs.20,000/- to the complainant-wife.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that despite his best efforts, the petitioner did not respond for the compliance of the order regarding his appearance before the Mediation and Conciliation Centre.

The report has been sent by the Mediator of the Mediation Centre, Gurdaspur dated 29.10.2021, which find mentioned that a cheque of Rs.20,000/- as litigation expenses has been handed over to the complainant-wife. However, six mediation sessions were held with the parties on four different dates, in which party No.1-Pawan Kumar did not appear before the Mediation Centre, Gurdaspur on 08.09.2021, 28.09.2021, 19.10.2021, 26.10.2021 and 28.10.2021. It has been concluded by the Mediator that the petitioner-Pawan Kumar seems to be not interested in pursuing the matter in Mediation Centre.

From the facts and circumstances on record, I am convinced that the petitioner is not keen for complying with the order of this Court and thus does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail.

In the above facts and circumstances, the present petition is dismissed.

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

02.11.2021

manju

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No