



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

314/2

CRM-M-49580-2024 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 09.12.2024

NAVDEEP KAUR

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY

Present : Mr. Nandal Jindal, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Amit Shukla, AAG Punjab.
Mr. Tushar Sabharwal, Advocate for the complainant.

SANJIV BERRY, J. (ORAL)

1. Status report dated 07.12.2024 filed in the form of an affidavit of Deputy Superintendent of Police, City-II, District Patiala, is taken on record. Copy thereof has been supplied to learned counsel for the petitioner.
2. Arguments heard.
3. By way of present petition preferred under Section 528 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, the petitioner has sought quashing of impugned order dated 14.08.2024 (Annexure P-4) passed by the Court of learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Patiala, whereby the petitioner was declared as proclaimed offender in case FIR No.199 dated 24.12.2019 registered under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471 IPC at Police Station Urban Estate Patiala, District Patiala.



4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that in compliance to the order dated 14.11.2024 passed by this Court, the petitioner has appeared in the Court and furnished his requisite bail bonds. He has placed on record copy of the order dated 21.11.2024, passed in case titled as ‘State Vs. Harinder Singh @ Babbu’, CHI-220-2020, whereby the petitioner has furnished her bail bonds and surety bonds.

5. Learned State counsel has not disputed the aforesaid factum.

6. During the course of proceedings on 14.11.2024, the following order was passed.

“3. It is, inter alia, contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner after having been granted anticipatory bail in case FIR (supra) had been appearing in the Court, however, later on account of compromise having been effected between the parties on 05.11.2020 under misguided advice, the petitioner could not appear in the Court, leading to issuance of non-bailable warrants and the proclamation vide order dated 20.03.2024 (Annexure P-7) passed by learned JMIC, Patiala. He further contends that in the meanwhile, parties have again effected compromise on 06.09.2024 (Annexure P-5) and seeking quashing of the impugned order (supra).

4. Notice of motion, returnable for 09.12.2024.

5. On the asking of the Court, Mr. Ankit Grewal, DAG, Punjab, who is present in Court, accepts notice and does not dispute the factual matrix of the case.

6. Mr. Tushar Sabherwal, Advocate, has entered appearance in Court, on behalf of respondent No. 2 and also admits the factum of compromise between the parties.

7. Without commenting on the merits of the case and considering the factum of compromise being effected between the parties qua which a separate petition for quashing of the petition has been filed by the petitioner and the co-accused, the petitioner is directed to appear before the learned Trial Court/Judge on duty/Duty Magistrate within a period of 07 days from today and in that event, learned Trial Court/Judge on duty/Duty



Magistrate will admit the petitioner on interim bail subject to its satisfaction on her furnishing requisite bail/surety bonds, however, subject to deposit of a cost of Rs. 10,000/- in the District Legal Services Authority, Patiala, before furnishing bail/surety bonds.

8. The petitioner shall also furnish a specific undertaking before the learned Trial Court/Judge on duty that, in future, she would be regularly appearing before the concerned Court on each and every date and in case of some exigency, she will seek prior permission of the concerned Court qua his exemption to appear on the date fixed.”

7. Keeping in view the fact that the petitioner has already appeared in the Court and furnished his requisite bail/surety bonds consequent to the order dated 14.11.2024, passed by this Court, the present petition is allowed. The order dated 14.08.2024 (Annexure P-4) passed by the Court of learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Patiala is set aside and the interim bail granted vide order dated 14.11.2024 is hereby confirmed.
8. The petition stands allowed.
9. Pending applications, if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE

09.12.2024
S.Sharma(syr)

- | | | |
|-----|----------------------------|--------|
| i) | Whether speaking/reasoned? | Yes/No |
| ii) | Whether reportable? | Yes/No |