

201

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-25507-2022

Date of Decision:- 16.05.2023

Vishal Ratti

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab and Another

...Respondents

CORAM:-HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE AMARJOT BHATTI

Present: Mr. Vinay Puri, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Kunwarbir Singh, Assistant A.G. Punjab.

Mr. Kapil Khanna, Advocate
for respondent No. 2.

AMARJOT BHATTI, J. (Oral)

The petitioner – Vishal Ratti has filed this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No. 14 dated 22.02.2019 under Section 406, 498-A of IPC, registered at Police Station Women Cell, District Jalandhar (Annexure P-1).

The facts of the case are that the complainant – Shivali filed written complaint against her husband Vishal Ratti and others alleging that she got married with Vishal Ratti on 19.06.2017. Her mother had spent Rs.10-12 lacs at the time of marriage. She had given customary shagun, gifts at the time of different functions. She was given electrical goods, utensils, motorcycle make Bajaj Vikrant etc. At the time of marriage, it was told that her husband will take her to Dubail alongwith him. The behaviour of her husband was good for about two months. Thereafter, the behaviour of her husband and family members changed. She could not conceive during

that period. She was continuously harassed by her husband and entire in-laws family. She was also sent for medical checkup. She was declared medically fit. Even then, she was taken to different hospitals. She was not permitted to go out alone. Thereafter, her husband started raising demand of Rs. 1 lac as he was to return from Dubai. The behaviour of her husband was abusive and bad towards her. Ultimately on 18.06.2018, she was turned out of the matrimonial home. Despite efforts made by her mother and other respectables, the matter could not be reconciled. The matter was investigated and thereafter, the present FIR has been registered.

Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that the matter has been compromised between the parties. He has already joined the investigation and he is still ready to do so. He is not required for any other purpose. Therefore, the *ad interim* bail already granted in his favour may be confirmed.

The aforesaid compromise is also confirmed by the learned counsel for respondent No. 2.

I have considered the aforesaid facts. The matter has been compromised and the petitioner has also joined the investigation. He is not required for any other purpose. Therefore, the *ad interim* bail already granted in favour of the petitioner – Vishal Ratti vide order dated 02.06.2022 stands confirmed, subject to the conditions enshrined under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

The petition is accordingly, accepted.

16.05.2023

lalit

(AMARJOT BHATTI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:
Whether reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No