

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

**CRM-M-18175-2020
Date of decision: 21.09.2020**

Harpreet Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

Present:- Mr. M. K. Dhot, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Joginder Pal Ratra, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Simranjeet Singh, Advocate
for the complainant.

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J. (Oral)

The petitioner prays for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No. 63 dated 06.06.2020, registered under Sections 406 and 498-A of the IPC at Police Station Banur, District Patiala.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is the husband of complainant and the FIR has been registered on a pretext that complainant/wife was maltreated and there was a consistent demand of dowry. It is further stated in the FIR that marriage of the petitioner and complainant took place on 24.11.2018 and parents of the complainant had given demanded dowry articles including one Hyundai Verna Car along with cash amount of Rs. 8 Lakh and an amount of Rs. 10 Lakh was spent on the other dowry articles, list of which is given in the FIR itself.

It is further stated in the FIR that when the complainant became pregnant, she was maltreated by the accused persons and despite convening

a Panchayat, the pregnancy of the complainant was aborted against her wish.

Learned counsel further submits that in fact the petitioner has filed a petition for divorce under Sections 12 and 13 of the Hindu Marriage Act on account of some incurable disease of the complainant and as a counter blast of the same, the present FIR has been registered.

Learned State counsel, assisted by learned counsel for the complainant, submits that a due enquiry was conducted in this case and some of the family members were exonerated by the police and the petitioner/husband was found involved in this case, therefore, the present FIR was registered.

It is further submitted that even in the list of articles including Verna Car was verified and during investigation, the petitioner agreed to pay Rs. 38 Lakh as full and final settlement, however, later on, he backed out.

This Court, even on an earlier occasion on 15.07.2020, had directed the parties to appear before the Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court and as per report of the Mediator, no settlement could be arrived at between the parties.

Learned counsel for the complainant additionally argues that complainant has agreed to receive a sum of Rs. 28 Lakh instead of Rs. 38 Lakh but the petitioner backed out even from the same and he is not ready to settle the dispute.

After hearing learned counsel for the parties, without commenting on the merits of the case, considering the serious allegations

against the petitioner, I find no ground to grant concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

Accordingly, this petition is dismissed.

21.09.2020

Waseem Ansari

(ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No