

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

CRM-M-7792-2017

Date of decision: 12.9.2017

Bhajan Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr.Amit Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner

Mr.AS Gill, Sr.DAG, Punjab
assisted by HC Sukhdev Singh

Mr.RS Sekhon, Advocate for the complainant

JITENDRA CHAUHAN, J.

The present petition under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure has been filed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case First Information Report No.001 dated 3.1.2017 registered under Sections 406, 498-A and 120-B of the Indian Penal Code at Police Station Women Cell, Ludhiana.

Contents that there is no specific allegation against the petitioner and same are general and vague in nature. The petitioner is the father-in-law of the complainant. He is a septuagenarian. In pursuance of the order dated 9.3.2017, he has joined the investigation and nothing is to be recovered from him as all the dowry articles have been returned.

On the other hand, the learned counsel for the State as well

as the learned counsel complainant oppose the prayer of the petitioner and submit that recovery of dowry articles has yet to be effected and the petitioner has not transferred the land in the name of his grandson till date as per his undertaking made before the Mediator. The cheque given by the petitioner on the last date of hearing to the complainant has also been dishonoured.

Heard.

As reflected in the order dated 9.3.2017, the petitioner, who is father-in-law of the complainant, had voluntarily made an undertaking before the Mediator of this Court that he will transfer three Kanals of land in the name of his grandson. Despite lapse of so much time, the land has not been transferred by the petitioner. Even at this stage there is no statement to do the needful in terms of the undertaking made. Moreover, the cheque handed over to the complainant for a sum of Rs.20,000/- towards litigation expenses has also been dishonoured. The petitioner has repeatedly changed his stance, therefore, the Court feels that the statement made before this Court lacked *bona fide* and made either to gain time or mislead the Court.

Dismissed.

However, anything stated hereinabove shall have no bearing on the merits of the case.

12.9.2017

gsv

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking / reasoned?

Yes / No

Whether reportable?

Yes / No