

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

CRM-M-27846-2019
Date of Decision: 18.04.2022

CHANDNI

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present : Mr. Jaideep Verma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. R.S. Sidhu, A.A.G., Punjab.

Mr. Gaurav Goel, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (ORAL)

Prayer in the present petition is for cancellation of anticipatory bail granted to respondent No.2 vide order dated 31.01.2019 in case FIR No.75 dated 11.09.2017 registered under Sections 406, 498-A IPC at Police Station Women, Ludhiana.

During the pendency of the petition, the parties were referred to the Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court but despite their best efforts, the matter could not be resolved.

I have heard learned counsel for both the parties.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that as on date, the arrears of maintenance is Rs.2,60,000/- and the monthly maintenance was Rs7,000/-. However, respondent No.2 is not even paying that amount

since long.

Learned counsel for respondent No.2 has submitted that out of total amount of Rs.2,60,000/-, he would clear Rs.1 lac by depositing the same in the account of the petitioner-wife tomorrow i.e. on 19.04.2022 itself. He has prayed for some reasonable time to clear the rest of the amount i.e. Rs.1,60,000/- standing as arrears. The remaining amount, he would clear in three equal monthly instalments starting from May, 2022. Besides this, he would keep on paying Rs.7,000/- which would be over and above the monthly arrears.

After hearing the learned counsel for the parties, the Court finds the submissions made by learned counsel for respondent No.2 genuine and rational one and hence grants time to respondent No.2 to clear the arrears in three equal instalments starting from May upto the end of July i.e. 31.07.2022, besides the payment of regular maintenance of Rs.7,000/- p.m., which would be over and above the amount of instalment.

The petition is disposed of with the aforesaid observations.

Needless to say that if respondent No.2 fails to abide by the undertaking given to this Court today, the petitioner would be at liberty to approach this Court to revive the present petition.

18.04.2022

gurpreet

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)

JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:

Yes/No

Whether reportable:

Yes/No