

**In the High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana
At Chandigarh**

CRM-M-33815-2019 (O&M)
Date of Decision:-16.11.2019

Gurpreet Singh ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another ... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Samrit Gill, Advocate for
Mr. Sandeep Arora, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Ruchika Sabherwal, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab,
assisted by ASI Jagjit Singh.

Mr. Puneet Singh, Advocate for
Mr. Rakesh Kapila, Advocate for respondent No.2.

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J.(Oral)

1. The petitioner has approached this Court seeking grant of anticipatory bail in respect of a case registered vide FIR No.76 dated 8.6.2019 at Police Station City Gurdaspur under Sections 406, 498-A, 342, 323 and 34 of Indian Penal Code.
2. The FIR was lodged at the instance of Hina, wherein it has been alleged that her marriage was solemnized with the petitioner Gurpreet Singh on 11.10.2016 and that her parents had given dowry beyond their means including jewellery weighing about 13 tolas, LED TV, washing machine, AC etc. but shortly after marriage her in-laws started demanding more dowry and

used to harass her in order to press upon their demands of dowry. It is alleged that on 7.5.2019 her husband hurled abuses and pressed her neck while her father-in-law gave beatings with a stick.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case on account of some matrimonial discord. It has further been submitted that the entire allegations of demand of dowry are false inasmuch as it is a case of love marriage.
4. Opposing the petition, the learned State counsel assisted by Mr. Puneet Singh, Advocate for Mr. Rakesh Kapila, Advocate for respondent No.2, has submitted that since specific allegations have been levelled in the FIR and the petitioner happens to be husband of the complainant, no case for grant of bail is made out. It has, however, been informed that pursuant to interim directions issued by this Court on 21.8.2019, the petitioner has since joined investigation. The learned State counsel has, however, submitted that despite the petitioner joining investigation, the alleged articles of dowry could not be recovered.
5. I have considered rival submissions addressed before this Court.
6. The present case apparently seems to have arisen out of some matrimonial discord. The veracity of allegations would be established during the course of trial. In any case, since the petitioner has already joined investigation, custodial interrogation is not warranted. The petition, as such, is accepted and the interim directions issued by this Court vide order dated 21.8.2019 are hereby made absolute subject to the condition that the petitioner shall join investigation as and when called upon to do so and cooperate with the

Investigating Officer and shall also abide by the conditions as provided under
Section 438 (2) Cr.P.C.

16.11.2019

pankaj

(Gurvinder Singh Gill)
Judge

Whether speaking /reasoned	Yes / No
Whether Reportable	Yes / No