

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

CRM-M-39674 of 2014

Date of Decision: 9.4.2015

Satwinder Singh

.....Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab and another

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK

Present : Mr. Vijay Lath, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. R.S.Randhawa, Additional A.G. Punjab.

Mr. Pankaj Sharma, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK J. (ORAL)

Petitioner seeks pre-arrest bail in FIR No. 211 dated 29.10.2014 under Sections 406/498-A IPC registered at Police Station Rupnagar, District Rupnagar.

Notice of motion was issued on the assurance given on behalf of the petitioner that he was willing to reconcile the dispute with the complainant-wife, as the dispute is a matrimonial one. Thereafter, three opportunities were granted to the petitioner, but he failed to make any sincere effort on his part. The petitioner tried to give impression before this Court that he was interested in settling

the matter amicably, but every time he failed to do so.

On the last date of hearing, following order was passed by this Court:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he has got the instructions to say that petitioner is ready for an amicable settlement on any reasonable terms and conditions.

Faced with the above, learned counsel for respondent no.2 submits that there are two daughters out of the wedlock and both are staying with the mother-respondent no.2. Petitioner is paying not even a single penny towards the maintenance of his daughters as well as complainant-wife.

In view of the above, hearing of the case is deferred to 9.4.2015.

In the meantime, petitioner is directed to bring an amount of ₹50,000/- by way of bank draft in the name of respondent no.2-Smt.Ramandeep Kaur, however, only as an interim measure.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner could not arrange the amount.

In fact, petitioner has not even tried to show his bonafide by offering any reasonable amount to the complainant towards maintenance of his wife as well as two minor daughters.

In view of the above, this Court is of the prima facie view

that the petitioner is trying to misuse the process of law. He has not complied with the order passed by this Court. Petitioner does not seem to be interested in settling the matter amicably. Petitioner seems to be hardly concerned about his own daughters as well as wife as to how they would be surviving themselves without there being any compensation being paid by him.

In view of the above, no case for anticipatory bail is made out.

Dismissed.

(RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK)
JUDGE

9.4.2015
Ak Sharma