

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

**104**

**CRM-M-3526-2022  
Decided on : 01.02.2022**

Ruksar

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondent(s)

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL**

**(Through Video Conferencing)**

PRESENT: Mr. Lupil Gupta, Advocate  
for the petitioner(s).

Ms. Tanushree Gupta, DAG, Haryana.

\*\*\*\*

**MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (Oral)**

The petitioner is seeking cancellation of bail, which was granted to respondents No.2 to 8 by the learned Addl. Sessions Judge, Sirsa (for brevity, 'learned ASJ') vide orders dated 16.12.2021 (annexed as Annexures P-7 to P-10, respectively), in case FIR No. 421, dated 22.11.2021, under Sections 294, 323, 34, 406, 498-A, 506 of IPC, registered at Police Station City Mandi Dabwali, District Sirsa (annexed as Annexure P-5).

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the FIR in question was registered against the private respondents, as they had been subjecting the petitioner to continuous mental and physical cruelty ever since her marriage with respondent No.2 on 05.08.2020, for not getting dowry as per their expectations. However, after the registration of the FIR in question, the parties arrived at an amicable settlement before the Mediation and Conciliation Centre, Sirsa, as a result of which a written compromise was executed between them on 09.12.2021 (annexed as Annexure P-6). It has been urged that after being granted the concession of anticipatory bail, the private respondents had resiled from the aforementioned compromise and hence, it was evident that under the garb of the compromise, they had managed to secure the concession of bail from the trial Court.

Heard and perused the impugned orders as well as other material on record.

The contention of the learned counsel that it was only because of the compromise (Annexure P-6) between the parties, the private respondents had been extended the concession of anticipatory bail is devoid of any merit. A perusal of the impugned orders reveals that the concession of anticipatory bail has not been extended to the accused-respondents only because of the compromise effected between the parties but also after considering other facts and circumstances of the case including the factum of the accused having joined investigation and their custodial interrogation not being required by the police. No doubt, the learned ASJ did notice the factum of compromise arrived at between the parties but that was not the sole consideration for grant of anticipatory bail to the accused-respondents. Moreover, the impugned orders (Annexures P-7 to P-10) do not contain any rider that the anticipatory bail so granted was subject to the compliance of the terms & conditions of the compromise (Annexure P-6).

Learned counsel has even otherwise failed to bring to the notice of this Court either any violation by the accused-respondents of the terms & conditions imposed upon them vide the impugned orders (Annexures P-7 to P-10) or any illegality, much less, perversity in the said orders.

In the facts & circumstances, as enumerated hereinabove, the instant petition being devoid of any merit, stands dismissed.

**(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)**  
**JUDGE**

**February 01, 2022**

*J.Ram*

*Whether speaking/reasoned:*      *Yes/No*  
*Whether Reportable:*              *Yes/No*