

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM No.M-27201 of 2014 (O&M)
Date of Decision: January 12, 2015

Bhupinder Singh

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

Present: Mr.N.S.Dandiwal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr.S.S.Chandumajra, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab
for the respondent-State.

Mr.B.S.Baath, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

INDERJIT SINGH, J.

Petitioner has filed this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C.
for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.04 dated 14.03.2014
under Sections 406 and 498-A IPC registered at Police Station NRI,
District Kapurthala.

Notice of motion was issued and learned State counsel as
well as learned counsel for respondent No.2 appeared and contested
the petition.

Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that no dowry
articles were received in this case. Only ring ceremony was
performed in India and the marriage was solemnized in Australia,

which facts have been contested by learned counsel for respondent No.2. Learned counsel for the petitioner further argued that no dowry was demanded or given as alleged in the FIR.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties as well as learned State counsel and have gone through the record.

As per the FIR, specific allegations have been levelled against the petitioner. Petitioner is the husband. Learned counsel for respondent No.2 argued that marriage of petitioner and respondent No.2 in Australia has also been solemnized only to fulfill the necessary conditions there. The allegations regarding demand of money etc. have also been levelled. It is also stated in the FIR that amount in cash as well as gold ornaments have been given in the dowry. Dowry articles are still in the possession of the present petitioner and same are yet to be recovered.

The petitioner is main accused and being husband, the dowry articles are supposed to be in his possession. The petitioner is required for custodial interrogation. As per FIR, main allegations are levelled against him.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, I do not find it a fit case where the petitioner is entitled to benefit of grant of anticipatory bail.

Therefore, finding no merit in the present petition, the same is dismissed.

January 12, 2015
Vgulati

(INDERJIT SINGH)
JUDGE