

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

Criminal Misc. No. M-9767 of 2019 (O&M)
Date of decision : May 28, 2019

Satinder Rikhi

....Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab

....Respondent

Coram: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Fateh Deep Singh

Present: Mr. Rakesh Gupta, Advocate, for the petitioner

Mr. Saurav Khurana, DAG, Punjab, for the State
assisted by ASI Pritam Singh, PS Women, Ferozepur

Mr. Nitin Jain, Advocate, for the complainant

Fateh Deep Singh, J. (Oral)

This anticipatory bail by accused-petitioner Satinder Rikhi has come up in case FIR No. 2 dated 21.1.2019 under Sections 498-A, 406 IPC, Police Station Women, Ferozepur.

Complainant Meenakshi Sharma wife of the petitioner in her allegations stated that her marriage with the petitioner was solemnized on 15.1.2017 where her family has spent about Rs 22/23

lacs including one Swift car besides other costly articles and cash were also given. However, the accused in-laws were not happy with the same and demanded more cash and articles and raised demand of Rs 10 lacs. On 17.12.2017, the complainant gave birth to a girl child on account of which the family felt hurt and the accused refused to return back all the articles of Ishtridhan which were entrusted to them and the complainant alleges that the same have been usurped by the accused leading to the registration of the present case.

Mr. Rakesh Gupta, Advocate, for the petitioner contends that all the allegations levelled against the petitioner are vague and ambiguous and there is neither any specific entrustment of Ishtridhan much less any criminal breach of trust qua them and therefore, prayed for grant of bail.

Learned State counsel Mr. Saurav Khurana, DAG, Punjab assisted by ASI Pritam Singh, PS Women, Ferozepur and Mr. Nitin Jain, Advocate, for the complainant have stoutly opposed the grant of the relief alleging that there is specific documentary proof which is placed on the records of the police regarding costly articles including gold and cash having been given at the wedding as well as shagun as per the desires of the accused side and which have been embezzled by them and therefore, custodial interrogation of the

petitioner who is principal accused is necessitated.

Going through the submissions, the petitioner admittedly is the husband and there are specific allegations against him regarding criminal breach of trust of the articles of Ishtridhan of the wife inspite of having been given a chance to return the articles the accused-petitioner has flatly refused to do so. Thus, in the light of this adamant stand of the petitioner his custodial interrogation is essential. Finding no merit in the present petition, the same stands dismissed.

May 28, 2019
'tiwana'

(Fateh Deep Singh)
Judge

Whether speaking/reasoned ?
Whether Reportable ?

Yes/No
Yes/No