

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

**CRM-M-44587-2016
Date of decision: 27.08.2018**

Ravinder Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JAISHREE THAKUR

Present: Mr.L.S. Sidhu, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Seena Mand, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Aditya Jain, Advocate,
for respondent No.2.

JAISHREE THAKUR, J. (ORAL)

This is a petition that has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 122 dated 26.10.2016 under Sections 498-A, 406, 420 IPC, registered at Police Station City Budhlada, District Mansa.

In brief, the facts are that a marriage was solemnized between the petitioner - Ravinder Singh and respondent No.2 Mandeep Kaur on 25.07.2015, however, due to matrimonial disputes the said marriage did not survive, which led to the registration of the above referred FIR.

Bail application of the petitioner herein was declined by the Courts below leading to the filing of the instant petition.

By order dated 14.12.2016, the petitioner herein had been directed to join investigation while taking note of the contention of the petitioner that he was ready to pay the equivalent amount towards the gold items which had yet to be recovered.

By order dated 17.03.2017, the Court noticed that the gold articles had yet to be recovered, however, the parties were sent to Mediation Centre to explore the possibility of compromise between them. The Mediation between the parties failed and this Court tried to make another effort to see whether a solution could be worked out between themselves.

Today, this Court is informed that in the proceedings that were initiated under Section 125 Cr.P.C. an altercation took place between the petitioner, his father and the complainant and her family members which has resulted in registration of another FIR No. 95 dated 01.08.2018 under Sections 341, 323, 354, 354-B & 34 IPC. An allegation has been raised that the petitioner and his family members attacked the complainant party and tore their cloths etc. outside the Court premises. On the registration of the FIR, father of the petitioner was arrested and the petitioner is now absconding.

Taking in view the registration of the fresh FIR and also taking into consideration that despite the allegation that the petitioner would make payment equivalent to the gold articles that had yet to be recovered, this

Court is not inclined to interfere in the matter.

Dismissed.

27.08.2018

Satyawan

(JAISHREE THAKUR)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes.
No.