

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

**CRM M 42330 of 2014
Date of Decision: 15.01.2015**

Sumeet Arora

.... Petitioner

vs.

State of Punjab

.... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present: Mr.Gaurav Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner
Mr.Nikhil K. Chopra, DAG Punjab
Mr.Veneet Sharma, Advocate for the complainant

- 1. Whether Reporters of Local Newspapers may be allowed to see the judgment ?*
- 2. To be referred to the Reporters or not ?*
- 3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?*

Kuldip Singh J.(Oral)

Allegations against the petitioner are that he was known to the complainant and that the complainant has been visiting him. Now the petitioner has started claiming that he had married the complainant. For this purpose, he has created evidence and has given threats to the complainant. The petitioner has placed on file some photographs as well as messages. In the photograph, the complainant is seen sitting with the petitioner. However, it is yet to be examined whether one of the photographs produced in this case was edited or not? The petitioner has filed a petition under Section 9 of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955, claiming the marriage.

In these circumstances, when there are allegations that the petitioner has fabricated the evidence of marriage with

complainant, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary.

No ground to grant anticipatory bail.

The petition is dismissed.

15.01.2015

gk

**(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE**