

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

CRM-M-33694-2014

Date of decision: 7.5.2015

Vikas Bharadwaj

...Petitioner

Versus

Staet of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS.JUSTICE SNEH PRASHAR

Present: Mr.Rajiv Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner

Ms.Tanushree Gupta, DAG, Haryana assisted by
ASI Ilam

SNEH PRASHAR, J.

The instant petition under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure has been filed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case First Information Report No. 635 dated 20.8.2014 registered under Sections 498A, 406, 506, 323 of the Indian Penal Code at Police Station Civil Lines, Karnal.

The accusation against the petitioner is that he maltreated and gave beatings to the complainant on account of his demand for additional dowry in the shape of a car. She was thrown out from the matrimonial home due to non-fulfilment of the demand.

Submissions made by Mr.Rajiv Sharma, Advocate
representing the petitioner and Ms.Tanushree Gupta, Deputy Advocate

General, Haryana appearing for the State have been heard.

It is submitted on behalf of the petitioner that the allegations levelled in the First Information Report are vague and general in nature. There is no medical evidence to show that the complainant was beaten up by the petitioner. He further submitted that the petitioner in compliance of the order passed by this Court has joined investigation and nothing remains to be recovered from him.

On the other hand, learned State counsel opposed the prayer of the petitioner and submitted that the dowry articles are yet to be recovered.

Vide order dated 9.10.2014, on the submission made by learned counsel for the petitioner that there are chances of settlement between the parties, the matter was referred to the Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court and the petitioner was allowed interim anticipatory bail. However, in the report of Mediator dated 2.5.2015, it is mentioned that the petitioner did not participate in the mediation proceedings, whereas the complainant alongwith her parents was present. Earlier also on 20.4.2015, the petitioner had not appeared before the Mediator. Prima facie, perusal of the FIR reveals that there are specific and serious allegations of the complainant that she was being maltreated and tortured for demand of additional dowry by her husband and other members of her in-laws family. They were pressurising her to bring a car and had also misappropriated the Istridhan.

Considering the gravity of the allegations and the fact that

the dowry articles are yet to be recovered from the petitioner, in the considered opinion of this Court, no ground to extend the interim anticipatory bail already granted to the petitioner is made out and the present petition is dismissed.

7.5.2015
gsv

(SNEH PRASHAR)
JUDGE