

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

Crl. Misc. No. M-9066 of 2016

Date of decision : 08.04.2016

Roshan Singh

... Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab and another

... Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANITA CHAUDHRY

Present: Mr. Rajbir Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner

Mr. V.P.S. Sidhu, AAG Punjab

Mr. Sarwinder Goyal, Advocate
for respondent No. 2

ANITA CHAUDHRY, J. (ORAL)

The petitioner is seeking anticipatory bail in FIR No. 11 dated 28.01.2016 registered at Police Station City Malout, District Sri Muktsar Sahib under Sections 494, 498-A, 406 IPC.

The petitioner was asked to implead the complainant. Amended Memo of parties was filed. Notice was given to the complainant who has put in appearance today.

Learned counsel for the petitioner urges that the petitioner has no concern with the complainant and she was not married to him and he was married to Renu 5 years ago and a dispute arose and a petition under Section 125 Cr.P.C. was filed and he is paying maintenance and this FIR had been filed only to humiliate him.

The complainant side has appeared and it is stated that the petitioner had married the complainant and has placed on record the marriage certificate dated 06.07.2012. It is stated that there is a child from

this wedlock and the petitioner did not inform that he was earlier married. It

is also stated that father of the petitioner had given an affidavit to the police that his son was beyond his control. It has been urged on behalf of the complainant that it is the worst form of cruelty and the petitioner has also cheated the complainant. He further states that his custodial interrogation is necessary as recovery is to be effected.

The petitioner has admitted his relationship with Renu. It had been pleaded that she was his wife. The complainant side has appeared and has placed on record marriage certificate to show that the petitioner had also married the complainant without getting a divorce from the first wife. There is a child from this relationship. It has been stated that recovery is to be effected and custodial interrogation is necessary.

The allegations against the petitioner are grave. The petitioner is not entitled to anticipatory bail.

The petition is dismissed.

(ANITA CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

April 08, 2016
reena