

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM No. M-2535 of 2015 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 19.5.2015

Gagandeep Singh

--Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

--Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA.

Present:- Mr. Prashant Vashisht, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Nikhil K. Chopra, D.A.G., Punjab.

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA.J

The instant petition has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C seeking the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case F.I.R. No.388 dated 20.12.2014 under Sections 376, 420 I.P.C, registered at Police Station, Focal Point, Ludhiana.

Counsel for the parties as also the complainant, who has come present in Court, have been heard.

Perusal of the F.I.R would reveal that allegations were made by complainant namely Kamaljeet Kaur as regards having been earlier married to one Rahul Verma and a girl child having been born out of such wedlock. Complainant has alleged that she was divorced from her husband on 8.9.2014. She had met the present petitioner on 16.2.2014 through the medium of internet i.e. Shadi.com, wherein the accused/petitioner had claimed also to be a divorcee. Thereafter, physical relations developed between the two on the false allurements of the petitioner entering into matrimony with the complainant. Further allegation is that by taking the complainant into confidence a number of gold items/jewelry belonging to the complainant herself as also of her mother, were taken away by the

petitioner. Thereafter the petitioner has refused to make any contact with the complainant and has even vacated the premises, where he was staying prior in point of time.

In the present petition there are specific averments made that the gold articles have been kept with Muthoot Finance for obtaining a loan and the petitioner was paying installments in relation thereto.

On a specific query having been put to the counsel for the petitioner in such regard, response is that there are no documents/material to substantiate such assertion.

Even the complainant, who is present in Court, has reiterated the allegations that even though the petitioner had claimed to be a divorcee but it has transpired subsequently that the petitioner is very much married and is not a divorcee. Even such fact and assertion made by the complainant has not met with any rebuttal by the counsel appearing for the petitioner.

Learned State counsel upon instructions from S.I. Mukesh Kumar would apprise the Court that the petitioner is also involved in a matter in which identical allegations have been raised by another lady namely Karandeep Kaur.

In the light of such serious allegations and keeping in view the conduct of the petitioner in the light of the observations contained in this order, this Court is of the considered view that he is not entitled to the concession of pre-arrest bail. This Court, as such, does not find any infirmity in the order dated 16.1.2015, passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ludhaina declining the application filed by the petitioner seeking anticipatory bail.

Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed.

Needless to observe that the interim protection granted by this Court vide order dated 23.2.2015 shall cease to operate.

Petition dismissed.

(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE

May 19, 2015
lucky