

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

CRM-M-8848-2021

Date of Decision: 06.10.2021

Harmohinder Kaur

..... Petitioner

Versus

Union Territory, Chandigarh

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present : Mr. Monty Goyal, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. B.R.Rana, Advocate, for
Mr. J.S.Toor, Addl.P.P., U.T., Chandigarh.

Mr. Tejesvi Rana, Advocate, for
Mr. Pawandeep Singh, Advocate,
for respondent no.2.

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J. (ORAL)

On 06.09.2021, the following order had been passed by this
court:-

“Case heard via video conferencing.

This is the second petition filed by the petitioner seeking to be admitted to anticipatory bail under the provisions of Section 438 of the Cr.P.C., upon FIR no.429, dated 10.12.2018, having been registered at Police Station, Sector-36, Chandigarh, alleging therein the commission of offences punishable under Sections 406, 420 and 120-B of the IPC.

Pursuant to the order dated 25.02.2021, Mr. B. R. Rana, Advocate, appears for Mr. J.S. Toor, learned Addl. P.P., U.T. Chandigarh, and submits that Mr. Toor is in some personal difficulty has not appeared, but has instructed him to say that the petitioner has joined investigation.

Mr. Pawandeep Singh, learned counsel appearing for respondent no.2, submits that the matter has in fact been compromised between the parties upon a demand draft of

Rs.10,00,000/- having been deposited in favour of the complainant with the Registry.

He submits that the total amount settled between the parties is Rs.20,00,000/- which would be paid by the petitioner to respondent no.2.

Mr. Gulati, Advocate, appears on behalf of Mr. Monty Goyal, learned counsel for the petitioner and submits that the demand draft actually stands expired and the petitioner wishes to re-validate it again.

Adjourned to 21.09.2021.

The Registry would release the demand draft to the petitioner for the purpose of re-validating it, after which it would be handed over to respondent no.2 by the petitioner.”

Today, Mr. Tejesvi Rana, Advocate, appears for Mr. Pawandeep Singh, Advocate, (who has also joined proceedings subsequently) and submits that the amount of Rs.10,00,000/- has now been paid by the petitioner to the complainant, i.e. respondent no.2.

That being so, this petition is allowed with the order dated 25.02.2021 made absolute.

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

06.10.2021
adhikari

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No