

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

CRM-M-38943-2017

Date of decision: February 20, 2019

Gurmeet Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ SHEKHAR ATTRI

Present: Mr. Vinod K. Kaushal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. V.G. Jauhar, Senior DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Akshay Sandhir, Advocate for
for respondent No. 3.

RAJ SHEKHAR ATTRI, J.(ORAL)

This is a petition filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for pre-arrest bail of petitioner-Gurmeet Singh in case bearing FIR No.63 dated 28.07.2017, under Sections 406/498-A of the Indian Penal Code, registered at Police Station Bhindi Saidan, District Amritsar Rural.

Learned State counsel has submitted that although the petitioner has joined the investigation yet he had not handed over the gold chain. Serious allegations have been levelled against him and even that he had not paid litigation expenses of Rs.10,000/- in compliance to order dated 05.10.2018 passed by this court.

Briefly stated that, it is a case of the prosecution that the petitioner-husband and his other family members had been demanding dowry from the respondent-wife. For this purpose, they were maltreating and beating her.

No maintenance was ever provided to her. Even when she turned out from the house. She was in her family way and due to the beatings given to her, the fetus had died due to kick blows given in her stomach.

In this case recovery of the articles of *istridhan* had not been effected.

Even petitioner had failed to comply with order dated 05.10.2018 to pay a sum of Rs.10,000/- as litigation expenses to the respondent-wife.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that earlier petitioner was electrocuted. For this purpose, this court has already called the record from the State which transpires that he remained admitted in the hospital from 31.10.2017 to 05.11.2017 and has been discharged on 05.11.2017 but this is no reason for non-compliance of the said order.

This court has considered the rival contentions made by learned counsel for the parties.

No ground is made out to grant the benefit of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

Petition is dismissed accordingly.

(RAJ SHEKHAR ATTRI)
JUDGE

February 20, 2019
m. sharma

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No