

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

CRM-M-15259-2019 (O&M)

Date of Decision:-26.8.2019

Sumeet Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and Another

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Aminder Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Kirat Singh Sidhu, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Sunny Singla, Advocate for respondent No.2.

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J.

1. The petitioner Sumeet Singh has approached this Court seeking grant of anticipatory bail in a case registered against him vide FIR No.40 dated 16.3.2019 under Sections 498-A and 406 IPC at Police Station City Sunam, District Sangrur.
2. The FIR was registered at the instance of Priyanka Bansal wherein it has been alleged that the complainant Priyanka Bansal was married to the petitioner Sumeet Singh on 29.1.2017 wherein upon demand of the accused and his parents i.e. father-in-law Jasdev Singh, mother-in-law Anupinder Kaur and Sukhleen Kaur, an amount of Rs. 21 lacs was spent on the marriage. It is alleged that various costly gifts and jewellery items were given to the accused and relatives. However, after the marriage, the

complainant's husband Sumeet Singh and her mother-in-law Anupinder Kaur said that it was not appropriate to keep gold and precious ornaments at home and they took away the gold and silver jewellery and also the amount collected as shagun, which was approximately Rs.50,000/- from her on the pretext of keeping the same in the locker which was never returned back to the complainant. It is alleged that the accused ill-treated and harassed her in order to press upon their demand for more dowry and was ultimately thrown out of her matrimonial home, after having been given beating.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that he has falsely been implicated in the present case and that the entire allegations of demand of dowry are false and that it is the complainant herself who does not wish to reside in her matrimonial home.
4. Opposing the petition, the learned State Counsel has submitted that in view of the specific and categoric allegations levelled in the FIR against the petitioner, no case for grant of anticipatory bail is made out.
5. I have considered rival submissions addressed before this Court. The case apparently arises out of some matrimonial discord between the parties. At this stage, it will not be appropriate for this Court to express any opinion regarding the veracity of the allegations. The learned State Counsel has informed that the petitioner, pursuant to interim directions has already joined investigation.
6. Bearing in mind the nature of offence, this Court is of the opinion that the facts of the case are such which do not warrant custodial interrogation. The petition, as such, is accepted and the interim directions issued vide order dated 14.5.2019 are hereby made absolute subject to the condition that the

petitioner shall appear and join the investigation as and when called upon to do so and cooperate with the Investigating Officer and shall abide by the conditions as provided under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

7. The petition stands accepted accordingly.

26.8.2019

kamal

(Gurvinder Singh Gill)
Judge

Whether speaking /reasoned

Yes / No

Whether Reportable

Yes / No