



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

221

CRM-M-29834-2024

Date of Decision : **August 01, 2024**

Shalika Wadhwa

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

State of U.T., Chandigarh

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present : Ms. Sharmila Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Manish Bansal, PP for UT, Chandigarh.

Mr. Ravi Malik, Advocate
for the complainant.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J. (Oral)

1. Through the instant petition, as instituted under Section 438 of the Cr.P.C., the petitioner seeks the concession of anticipatory bail, in case FIR No.86 dated 15.05.2024, under Sections 406, 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B of the IPC, and, Section 24 of the Immigration Act, registered at P.S. Central, Sector 17, Chandigarh,
2. Succinctly stated, the allegations levelled in the present FIR are that, the petitioner and her co-accused cheated the complainant for an amount of Rs.10,97,500/-, on the pretext of sending him abroad.
3. At the very outset, the learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner, who is a mother of a six months' old child, never had any intention to cheat the complainant, rather she is ready and willing to amicably settle the dispute with the complainant, through returning the amount received by her.



CRM-M-29834-2024

-2-

4. In view of the above statement made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, this Court vide order dated 13.6.2024, granted the relief of interim anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. Today, the learned counsel for the petitioner, at the very outset submits that, the petitioner has compromised the matter with 8 victims, out of total 9 victims, as named in the FIR (supra) and she is in the process of settling the dispute with the last victim as well. She further submits that the petitioner could settle the dispute in totality, however, she was arrested in a different criminal case.

6. On account of the supervening events, i.e. the arrest of the petitioner in a different case, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that she does not want to press the instant petition seeking relief of anticipatory bail, however, she prays for passing of direction upon the learned trial Court concerned to decide her regular bail application in a time bound manner.

7. This Court has considered the rival submissions made by the learned counsel for the parties concerned.

8. In view of the specific statement suffered by the learned counsel for the petitioner, the instant petition is ordered to be **dismissed**, as not pressed.

9. However, in case the petitioner files a regular bail application before the learned trial Court concerned, the latter shall decide the same expeditiously preferably within 6 days of filing thereof.

August 01, 2024
ajay-1

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned. : Yes/No
Whether Reportable. : Yes/No