

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

CRM-M-40477 of 2014
Date of Decision: 14.05.2015

Gagandeep Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SNEH PRASHAR

Present: Mr. H.S. Batth, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Ashish Sanghi, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Bikramjit Arora, Advocate
for the complainant.

SNEH PRASHAR, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure (Cr.P.C.) for grant of concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case First Information Report No.153 dated 26.09.2014 under Sections 498-A, 406 and 120-B of the Indian Penal Code (for short 'IPC) registered at Police Station Harike, District Tarn Taran.

2. Petitioner-Gagandeep Singh is the husband of Harneet Kaur on whose complaint the instant case was registered. The allegations of the complainant were that ever since her marriage with Gagandeep Singh she was being harassed and maltreated by her husband on account of demand for additional dowry in the shape of valuable

articles and cash amount etc.

3. Heard the Submissions made by Mr. H.S. Batth, Advocate representing the petitioner; Mr. Ashish Sanghi, DAG, Punjab representing the State and Mr. Bikramjit Arora, Advocate representing the complainant.

4. It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that in her complaint Harneet Kaur had raised accusations against other members of her in-laws family also, but during investigation, they were found to be innocent. It shows that the allegations are false. It is also apparent from the allegations that the complainant suspected her husband of having extra martial relations which became the root cause of dispute between them. Submitting that the petitioner was released on interim bail vide order of this Court dated 27.11.2014 and there is nothing to show that he has misused the concession given to him. Learned counsel prayed that the said order be made absolute.

5. The petition was opposed by learned State counsel as well as counsel appearing on behalf of the complainant.

6. Learned State counsel submitted that the petitioner has not joined investigation till date and no recovery of dowry articles have been made so far.

7. Indeed, there was no direction to the petitioner to join investigation. Only for purpose of exploring possibility of settlement between the parties, the petitioner was enlarged on interim bail.

8. There are specific allegations against the petitioner not only

of demand of dowry but also of treating the complainant with cruelty. She stated that she was often physically assaulted even after the birth of her daughter. Recovery of dowry articles is yet to be made and for the same custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary.

9. In view of the facts and circumstances of the case and least any expression above may cause prejudice to the case of either side, in my considered opinion no case for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner is made out and the petition is hereby dismissed.

May 14, 2015
rashmi

(SNEH PRASHAR)
JUDGE