

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

CRM-M No.24191 of 2015

Date of Decision: 21.08.2015

Parnav Patel

..... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASWANT SINGH

Present: Mr. R.P.Dhir, Advocate along with the petitioner.

Mr. Rajiv Doon, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana
for the respondent along with I.O./ASI Malkiat Singh.

Mr. Vikas Sharma, Advocate along with complainant-Garima.

JASWANT SINGH, J. (Oral)

The prayer is for grant of anticipatory bail on behalf of the petitioner/husband in case FIR No.80 dated 01.05.2015, under Sections 406, 498-A of IPC, registered with Police Station Sector 14, Panchkula.

Pursuant to the directions dated 14.08.2015 passed by this Court, the parties are present in the Court. The efforts for amicable settlement have failed.

As per the allegations of the complainant/wife, their marriage was solemnized on 18.01.2012 and a male child was born out of the wedlock on 30.11.2012. She stated to have been turned out of her house along with her minor son in September, 2014. In the FIR running into 25 pages, various instances of maltreatment, harassment, assault and demands of dowry have been detailed.

Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that from the contents of the FIR, no cruelty can be attributed to the husband and as far the returning of the remaining dowry articles i.e. *Kada, Ring, Chain* and *Coin* (all of gold), the petitioner is ready and willing to pay an amount worth the value. He further submits that rest of the dowry articles were sent by the Courier.

Learned Counsel for the complainant and learned State Counsel, on instructions from ASI Malkiat Singh states that the petitioner had only once joined the investigation and as per the list, substantial dowry articles are to be recovered and, therefore, his custodial interrogation is necessary.

It is not disputed that rest of the family members have been extended the benefit of anticipatory bail and the petitioner/husband is the only one, who remains to be extended such benefit although in the previous interim order, he was extended this benefit.

After hearing learned Counsel for the parties, keeping in view the nature of the allegations and dowry articles to be recovered, this Court finds no ground to extend the benefit of anticipatory bail to the petitioner/husband-Parnav Patel.

Accordingly, the present petition stands dismissed.

August 21, 2015
Gagan

(JASWANT SINGH)
JUDGE