

206 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-3391-2020
Date of Decision: 04.04.2022

BANTU @ BUNTY ... PETITIONER
V/S
STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER ... RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIVEK PURI

Present: Mr. Rakesh Gupta, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Hittan Nehra, Addl. A.G. Punjab.

Mr. Parvinder Singh, Advocate for respondent No.2.

* * *

VIVEK PURI, J. (ORAL)

Petitioner is seeking anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No. 93 dated 21.09.2019 under Sections 406, 498-A IPC, registered at Police Station Sadar Rajpura, District Patiala.

On 29.11.2021, following order was passed:

“Mr. Parvinder Singh, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of respondent No.2 and filed his power of attorney which is taken on record.

Learned counsel for the petitioner at the outset has apprised the Court that the parties have arrived at an amicable settlement before the Mediation and Conciliation Center to which the parties were referred to.

Learned counsel for respondent No.2 does not dispute the factum of a compromise indeed having been arrived at between the parties.

Adjourned to 04.04.2022.

Meanwhile, the petitioner is directed to join the investigation and appear before the investigating agency as and when called upon to do so. In the event of his arrest, he shall be admitted to interim bail on his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting/Investigating Officer. The petitioner shall abide by the terms and conditions as envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.”

As per the report received from the Mediation and Conciliation Center of this Court, the matrimonial dispute has been amicable settled between the parties. The Settlement/Agreement has also been attached with the report.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that in pursuance of the interim directions, the petitioner has joined the investigation.

Learned State counsel, on instructions of ASI Sukhwinder Singh has not assailed the aforesaid factual aspect of the case and has further stated that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required. Even learned counsel appearing for the complainant has affirmed the fact of amicable settlement.

In these set of circumstances, sufficient exceptional circumstances are made out to extend the concession of pre-arrest bail to the petitioner. The order dated 29.11.2021 is made absolute.

The petition stands allowed.

04.04.2022

Janki

(VIVEK PURI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No