

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

CRM-M-41435-2019 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 1.10.2019

Vikram Bamal

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. S.K.Verma, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Ashok Singh Choudhary, Addl. Advocate General, Haryana.

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J.

1. The petitioner has approached this Court seeking grant of anticipatory bail in a case registered against him vide FIR No.95 dated 6.8.2019 under Sections 323/34/494/498-A/420/467/468/506 IPC at Police Station Women, District Jind.
2. The FIR was registered at the instance of Deepshikha wherein it has been alleged that her marriage was solemnized with Vikram Bamal (petitioner) on 17.6.2009 and two daughters were born out of the wedlock and she was expecting a third baby. It is alleged that complainant's husband, father-in-law, mother-in-law and sister-in-law Pooja, however, used to harass her continuously but she has been tolerating the same. It is alleged that her mother-in-law was annoyed on account of the complainant having given birth to daughters. The complainant alleged that now she has come to know that her husband Vikram Bamal has solemnized marriage with one Gurmeet Kaur and has got the same registered before the Registrar of Marriages,

Meerut on 20.5.2019 whereby he had concealed the factum of his being already married. It is alleged that the complainant's husband is planning to go to Australia along with his wife while leaving her behind and had also got a passport issued on 29.5.2019 and that her sister-in-law Pooja has connived with her husband for the same.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that he has falsely been implicated in the present case and that allegations of second marriage are not substantiated as there is no evidence of any ceremony of marriage.
4. Opposing the petition, the learned State counsel has submitted that since the factum of the petitioner having got a second marriage registered has been got verified during investigation and that since there are specific allegations of harassment of the complainant by the petitioner, no case for grant of anticipatory bail is made out.
5. I have considered rival submissions addressed before this Court. Although the matter could have arisen initially out of some matrimonial discord but the allegations prima facie appear to be substantiated from the fact that the petitioner has even contracted second marriage. In these circumstances, this Court does not find any special case for grant of anticipatory bail.
6. There is no merit in this petition and the same is hereby dismissed.

1.10.2019

kamal

(Gurvinder Singh Gill)
Judge

Whether speaking /reasoned

Yes / No

Whether Reportable

Yes / No