

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-38859-2014

Date of decision: 23.07.2015

Surinder Singh Rawat

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R.P. NAGRATH

PRESENT: Mr. Hitesh Pandit, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Gazi Mohd., DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Rahul Rampal, Advocate for respondent No. 2.

R.P. NAGRATH, J. (ORAL)

This petition has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. by the petitioner seeking anticipatory bail in FIR No. 105 dated 20.09.2014 registered under Sections 406/498-A IPC at Police Station Women Cell, Ludhiana.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for complainant-respondent No. 2.

Petitioner is the husband of complainant/respondent No. 2-Reena. Marriage of petitioner with complainant was solemnized on 03.05.2013. The version in the FIR was that petitioner started harassing the girl on account of insufficient dowry. As per allegations made in the

FIR, complainant was turned out from the matrimonial house firstly on 01.09.2013 but the matter was patched up. Again for the second time, she was turned out of the house on 10.11.2013 and lastly on 13.02.2014. The complainant was also medically examined on 13.02.2014, when she was turned out of the matrimonial house for the last time statedly, by giving her beatings. The doctor had found 5 injuries on her person, out of which one was bruise with certain dimensions, on the bridge of nose. The circumstances in the case would suggest that there had been constant harassment and cruel treatment of the complainant and future of a newly wedded girl has been spoiled in such a way. So the allegations against the petitioner are very serious for which petitioner does not deserve the extraordinary relief of pre-arrest bail.

It is pertinent to note that when the interim bail was granted to petitioner, the matter was referred to Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court but the petitioner failed to avail of the appropriate remedy and the matter was not settled.

Learned counsel for complainant-respondent No. 2 submits that though 50 household items were recovered as part of dowry but complete items of gold have not been recovered. But this contention is not of much importance, at this stage as this is a matter of trial which can be raised during the course of trial.

In view of the above, there is no merit in the instant petition and the same is dismissed.

July 23, 2015
rishu

(R.P. NAGRATH)
JUDGE