

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

Crl. Misc. No. M-18429 of 2020

Date of Decision: July 13, 2020

Rahul Chopra

.....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SUDHIR MITTALPresent: Mr. B.K. Bali, Advocate
for the petitioner**Sudhir Mittal, J. (Oral)**

The petitioner is the husband of the complainant. An FIR dated 24.03.2020 has been registered at Police Station Ambala under Sections 354, 377, 406, 498-A, 511 IPC on the basis of a written complaint dated 02.03.2020. The contents of the FIR are that the petitioner and his family members harassed and humiliated the complainant for bringing less dowry. The petitioner even assaulted her. While leaving for the honeymoon to Dubai on 22.01.2020 the parents of the complainant were prevented by the petitioner from coming to their house to see them off. Before their departure, the mother-in-law called the parents of the complainant to bring Rs. 10 lacs or else to take away the complainant from the road side near Karnal. When the parents reached the spot the complainant was not permitted to go with them. Even after return from Dubai, the harassment continued.

It is relevant to note that the marriage was solemnized on 17.01.2020 and police complaint was made on 02.03.2020.

The incident on the date the couple was to leave for Dubai is

corroborated by the averments in the complaint made by the petitioner before the

Bengaluru police.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner discovered objectionable photographs of the complainant with her friend namely Sanchit Gupta and, thus, differences resulted. She called her parents to Bengaluru and left with her belongings resulted in lodging of a complaint before the Bengaluru police. The FIR has been registered as a counter blast to the discovery of unfaithfulness of the complainant by the petitioner and the police complaint made in Bengaluru.

A pointed question was put to learned counsel for the petitioner regarding the incident which took place on the day the couple was to leave for Dubai i.e. phone call demanding a sum of Rs. 10 lacs else to take the complainant away from near Karnal. He submitted that the incident has been wrongly quoted in the FIR. Infact the parents of the complainant wanted to give cash amount of Rs. 1 lac to the petitioner which he was refusing. This led to the misunderstanding.

The submission is not acceptable for the reason that the incident is mentioned even in the complaint made before Bengaluru police by the petitioner. It is, thus, clear that a misunderstanding took place between the parties on the day they were to leave for their honeymoon i.e. merely five days after the marriage. This lends credence to the allegations of harassment and demand of dowry made in the FIR. Allegations of unfaithfulness on the basis of some photographs allegedly discovered by the petitioner seem to be an excuse only because learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that after the petitioner discovered photographs same were deleted from the laptop by the complainant. If this was the case, I fail to understand how some photographs have been annexed with the petition.

The allegations regarding harassment, humiliation and demand of dowry are serious in nature, apart from such allegations being the reflection of a

must be strictly dealt with.

For the reasons aforementioned I see no ground to grant the benefit of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. The petition is, accordingly, dismissed.

July 13, 2020

reena

[SUDHIR MITTAL]
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether Reportable : Yes/No