

202

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

CRM-M-36451 of 2014

Date of decision: August 24, 2015

Vishal Sachdeva

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SABINA

Present: Mr. Veneet Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. R.P.S. Sidhu, AAG Punjab.

Mr. Bikram Jeet Arora, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

SABINA, J

Petitioner has filed this petition under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 seeking anticipatory bail in FIR No.263 dated 26.09.2014, under Section 498-A of Indian Penal Code, 1860 and Section 3 of Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005, registered at Police Station Cantonment, District Amritsar.

Following order was passed by this Court on 21.05.2015:-

“Report of the mediation and conciliation centre has been received submitting that the dispute between the parties could not be amicably settled.

The counsel appearing for the petitioner prays for adjournment submitting that he has been engaged now by the petitioner.

List for arguments on 24.08.2015.

Interim order dated 10.11.2014 is extended till next date with the modification that the appellant will surrender before the police within a week and join the

investigation and in the event of his arrest being required he will be allowed interim bail till next date to the satisfaction of the arresting officer, subject to compliance of the conditions specified under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.”

The case was referred to Mediation and Conciliation Centre. However, no settlement could be arrived between the parties.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that petitioner has joined investigation.

Learned State counsel who is assisted by the counsel for the complainant has submitted that, although, petitioner has joined investigation but recovery of gold ornaments and other articles is yet to be effected.

Prosecution story in brief is that the petitioner got married to the complainant on 05.08.2013. The case of the complainant is that sufficient dowry was given by the her parents at the time of her marriage to her in-laws family. However, complainant was harassed by her in-laws family on account of insufficient dowry.

In the present case, although, petitioner has joined investigation, but recovery of the gold ornaments as well as other articles is yet to be effected.

Hence, no ground for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner is made out.

Dismissed.

**(SABINA)
JUDGE**

August 24, 2015
mahavir