

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh

.....

Criminal Misc. No.M-3164 of 2015

.....

Date of decision:4.9.2015

Raghu Midha

...Petitioner

v.

State of Haryana

...Respondent

....

Coram: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Inderjit Singh

.....

Present: Mr. Inderpal Singh Parmar, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Himmat Singh, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana
for the respondent-State.

Mr. Navjot Singh, Advocate for the complainant.

.....

Inderjit Singh, J.

The petitioner has filed this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C.
for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.968 dated 11.12.2014
registered for the offences under Sections 323, 406, 498-A and 506 IPC at
Police Station Civil Lines Karnal, District Karnal.

Notice of motion was issued in this case. Mr. Himmat Singh,
learned Assistant Advocate General, Haryana, has appeared on behalf of the
respondent-State and Mr. Navjot Singh, learned Advocate has appeared on
behalf of the complainant and contested this petition. Police record is also
available.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone

through the record.

The FIR in the present case has been registered by complainant-Divya wife of the present petitioner. The allegations in the FIR have been levelled against the petitioner regarding demand of dowry, misappropriation of dowry articles and harassment etc. The petitioner has been granted interim bail and he was asked to join the investigation. The matter was also sent to the Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court where the matter was not settled between the parties. Today, the learned State counsel on the basis of Police record argued that till today not a single dowry article has been returned by the petitioner.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case that the present petitioner was granted the benefit of interim bail since 30.1.2015 and he has not given the dowry articles and same are supposed to be in his possession and the dowry articles still to be recovered, the petitioner is required for custodial interrogation. Otherwise also, in the facts and circumstances of the case, I do not find it a fit case where the present petitioner is entitled to the benefit of anticipatory bail.

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

September 4, 2015.

(Inderjit Singh)
Judge

hsp