

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

202/1

CRM-M-8043-2022 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 01.06.2023

Luckdeep Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present:- Mr. Ritesh Pandey, Advocate for the petitioner

Ms. Guramrit Kaur, DAG, Punjab
(assisted by ASI Palwinder Singh)

Mr. Vipin Mahajan, Advocate for the complainant

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. On 24.02.2022, the following order was passed:-

“Petitioner is seeking concession of anticipatory bail in case FIR No. 116, dated 30.12.2021, u/s 420, 494 IPC, registered at P.S. Rangar Nangal, tehsil Batala, District Batala (annexed as Annexure P-1). Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that a totally false and fabricated story has been brought-forth by wife i.e. complainant, alleging that he had solemnized marriage with one Sukhwinder Kaur, during the subsistence of his marriage with her. Learned counsel further submits that except for her bald allegations there is no evidence to lend support to the said allegations. He further submits that a false story has been coined that the said Sukhwinder Kaur had taken Rs. 2.25 lakhs in cash from the complainant

on the promise of getting a job for her brother and sister, so as to bring it within the ambit of non-bailable offences.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of the Court, Ms. Gunkirat Kaur, AAG, Punjab, who is appearing through video conferencing, accepts notice on behalf of the State.

Mr. Vipin Mahajan, Advocate, has put in appearance on behalf of the complainant and prays for time to file reply. He is directed to file his power of attorney in the registry.

Let requisite copies of the complete paper book be supplied to the learned State counsel as well as counsel for the complainant during the course of the day.

Adjourned to 31.03.2022.

Meanwhile no coercive steps be taken against the petitioner till the next date of hearing.”

2. Learned counsels for the parties are *ad idem* that matter has been amicably settled between the parties.

3. Learned counsel for the complainant submits that he has no objection, if interim protection granted to petitioner is made absolute. However, he further submits that complainant may be granted liberty to move an appropriate application seeking cancellation of bail, if petitioner fails to comply with terms and conditions of the compromise

4. Learned State counsel does not object to arrangement made between the parties.
5. In view of above facts and circumstances, the petition is allowed and the interim protection granted to the petitioner vide order dated 24.02.2022 is made absolute subject to the conditions envisaged under Section 438(2) of Cr.P.C.
6. If the petitioner or his family members/associates make any attempt to threat/intimidate the witnesses in the present case, the State would be at liberty to move an application for cancellation of bail granted by this order.
7. It is made clear that petitioner shall comply with his undertaking and in case he fails to comply with his commitment, the complainant shall be at liberty to move an appropriate application seeking cancellation of petitioner's bail.
8. Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed as expression of opinion of this Court on merits of the case and Trial Court shall proceed without being prejudiced by observations of this Court.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

01.06.2023

Mohit Kumar

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>