

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

Sr. No. 202 (1)

CRM-M No.30895 of 2019 (O&M)

Date of decision : 21.01.2022

Gopal Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK SIBAL

Present : Mr. H. S. Aujla, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Rashmi Attri, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. D. S. Saini, Advocate for respondent No.2.

* * *

DEEPAK SIBAL, J. (Oral)

The matter has been taken up through video conferencing.

The present petition has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for the grant of anticipatory bail in complaint No. COMI – 32 dated 11.07.2017 titled as “Bhupinder Kaur Vs. Gopal Singh and others” under Sections 452, 451, 341, 323, 506, 426 IPC and Sections 3 (x) and 3 (2) iii of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act 1989, Police Station Kharar Sadar.

On 06.11.2019, this Court had passed the following order : -

“Contends that occurrence had taken place on 06.06.2015 and the petitioner lodged an FIR bearing No. 123, under Sections 323, 325 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code, registered at Police Station Sadar Kharar, District SAS Nagar against complainant-Bhupinder Kaur and others on 06.09.2015. Further contends that the present complaint has been filed as a counter blast to the above

FIR after a period of two years i.e. 11.07.2017 and the petitioner has been summoned under Sections 452,323, 506 IPC and Section 3(x) of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of atrocities), Act, 1989, which is misuse of the process of the Court.

Despite the case having been called twice, none appeared on behalf of respondent No.2-complainant.

In the interest of justice, adjourned to 16.12.2019.

In the meantime, petitioner is directed to join the proceedings before learned trial Court and he be released on interim bail till the next date of hearing on his furnishing adequate bail bonds/surety bonds subject to its satisfaction .”

Learned State counsel submits that under the afore-quoted order passed by this Court, the petitioner had joined the proceedings before the Trial Court and had been granted interim bail. Thereafter charges were framed and when the entire prosecution evidence had been led, the petitioner and respondent No.2 compromised the matter.

After considering the above developments, this Court is of the opinion that the afore quoted order of this Court dated 06.11.2019, granting interim anticipatory bail to the petitioner should be made absolute and it is so ordered.

21.01.2022

sunil yadav

**(DEEPAK SIBAL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes / No

Whether reportable : Yes / No