

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

CRM-M-1100-2016 (O&M)

Date of decision : 27.11.2017

Gurmeet Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. Parvinder Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Anju Arora, Addl.A.G., Punjab,
assisted by ASI Mohan Singh.

Mr. Dilpreet Singh Gandhi, Advocate for respondent No.2.

JITENDRA CHAUHAN, J. (Oral)

The instant petition has been filed under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.0211 dated 28.10.2015, registered under Sections 498-A and 406 of the Indian Penal Code, (for short, 'the IPC') at Police Station City Kharar, District S.A.S. Nagar.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the complainant herself left the matrimonial home and the petitioner is still ready and willing to settle the dispute. It is further stated that in terms of the orders passed by this Court, the petitioner has repeatedly joined the investigation.

On the other hand, learned State counsel, on instructions,

submits that though the petitioner has joined the investigation, but he is not cooperating. The recovery is still to be effected. She further states that the plot owned by the complainant was allegedly sold by the petitioner without her permission or consent and the sale proceeds have been used to purchase another plot in the name of the petitioner's sister.

Learned counsel for the complainant contends that the booking amount qua the plot in question was paid by the father of complainant-respondent No.2. The remaining amount was also paid by her family members.

Heard.

As per the allegations, the property purchased in the name of respondent No.2 was subsequently sold by the petitioner without knowledge and permission of the complainant and out of the sale proceeds, another property was purchased in the name of complainant's sister-in-law, Baljeet Kaur. Apart from the above, the recovery of dowry articles is yet to be effected. The Court feels that it is a fit case where custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required to unearth the truth.

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

Dismissed.

However, nothing noticed hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

27.11.2017
atulsethi

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking / reasoned :	Yes	No
Whether Reportable :	Yes	No