

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

Crl. Misc. No.M-2591 of 2016

Date of Decision: 25.01.2016

Manpreet Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

....Respondent

BEFORE :- HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE DAYA CHAUDHARY

- 1. Whether reporters of local newspapers may be allowed to see the judgment ? (Yes/No)**
- 2. To be referred to reporters or not ? (Yes/No)**
- 3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest ? (Yes/No)**

Present:- Mr. Mukesh Bhatnagar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

DAYA CHAUDHARY, J.

This petition has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, in case, FIR No.334 dated 08.12.2015 registered under Sections 494/420/506 IPC at Police Station Kotwali, District Bathinda.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the complainant was having love affair with the petitioner and everything was in her knowledge. Subsequently, she changed her mind and hence, the present FIR was registered after a period of more than one month of the marriage. He further submits that if there was any consent of the parents of the complainant then there would have been no occasion to get the marriage performed at Chandigarh. Moreover, no offence is made out under Section 420 IPC. It has wrongly been mentioned in the FIR that the complainant is a poor person, whereas, she is a dancer. No offence is made out under Sections 494/506 IPC and both the offences are bailable.

Nothing is to be recovered from the petitioner and he is ready to join

investigation.

Heard the arguments of learned counsel for the petitioner and have also perused the allegations levelled in the FIR.

A perusal of contents of FIR shows that the complainant was given assurance for getting her appointed in the government service or in the bank. It was stated that the petitioner was un-married and was doing job. Subsequently, the complainant and petitioner got married. The factum of earlier marriage was concealed by him. The marriage of the petitioner with complainant was also registered before Registrar Marriage, Chandigarh. Later on, it was informed by the earlier wife Baljit Kaur @ Deepo herself that the petitioner was married with her 4-5 years back. On being afraid of the fact, which came in the knowledge of the complainant with regard to petitioner's earlier marriage, he took out the pistol from his dub and threatened her that in case, this fact is told to anybody then she will be killed. An amount of ₹ 50,000/- was duped from her.

By considering the allegations as have been levelled in the FIR, the petitioner does not deserve concession of anticipatory bail, hence his custodial interrogation is required as not only his marriage with the complainant has been registered with the Registrar Marriage, Chandigarh but he is already married. The allegations of giving threat and receiving of ₹ 50,000/- are also there.

In view of the fact that there are serious allegations of concealment of fact and fabrication of documents, no ground is made out to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner and the petition, being devoid of any merit, is hereby dismissed.

25.01.2016
gurpreet

(DAYA CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE