

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**M.CR.C.(A). No. 1472 of 2018**

Manpreet Singh, S/o. Late Shri Pritpal Singh, Aged About 33 Years, R/o.-
3A/265, Ashok Nagar, Near Suchha Singh Halwai, R.K. Nagar, Kanpur
Nagar, Uttar Pradesh.

----Applicant**Versus**

State Of Chhattisgarh, Through- Station House Officer, Mahila Police
Station Bilaspur, Civil and Revenue District- Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh.

---- Respondent

For Applicant	: Mr. Purnendra Khicharia, Advocate
For Respondent/State	: Mr. Aadil Minhaz, P.L.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Rajendra Chandra Singh Samant**Order On Board****21/01/2019**

1. Apprehending arrest in connection with Crime No.1/2018, registered at Police Station – Mahila Police Station, Bilaspur, District – Bilaspur (C.G.) for offence punishable under Section 498-A, 34 of the Indian Penal Code, the applicant has preferred this application for grant of anticipatory bail.
2. It is submitted by the learned counsel for the applicant, that the applicant has been falsely implicated in this case. No case is made out against the applicant on the basis of the material present in the case diary. The marriage of the applicant with complainant Harvin Kaur was solemnized on 07.05.2010. Complainant has left the matrimonial home in the year 2015 and is residing in her parental house. After lapse of almost more than two years, she filed written

complaint in November, 2017 with the police on the basis of which, FIR has been lodged in January, 2018. The delay in filing the complaint and lodging of FIR shows that allegations made are deliberate and concocted. Therefore, it is prayed that the applicant may be enlarged on anticipatory bail.

3. Per contra learned State counsel opposes the application for grant of bail and the submissions made in this respect. It is submitted that according to the allegation, this applicant had been making demand of Rs.50.00 lakhs and car of Honda City company and he had made a condition for the complainant to arrange the same before she comes to reside with him. Therefore, it is prayed that the applicant may not be released on bail.
4. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the case diary and the documents placed on record.
5. Complainant Harvin Kaur has lodged report making allegation that soon after the marriage, she was tortured by her husband, the applicant, who was making demand of Rs.50.00 lakhs in cash and car of Honda City company. It is alleged that in the year 2015, the complainant was by force brought to her parental house and left there by the applicant himself with a condition that she should arrange cash and car only then she will come back for residing with him.
6. Considered the submissions and the contents of the case diary. After considering on the allegation that have been made against the applicant and also the report of the Counseling Committee, which shows that this applicant had not taken any interest to appear before the Counseling Committee. Hence, for this reason, this

Court is not inclined to extend the benefit of Section 438 of Cr.P.C. to the applicant.

7. Accordingly, the anticipatory bail application filed under Section 438 of Cr.P.C. is rejected.

Sd/-
(Rajendra Chandra Singh Samant)
Judge

Balram