

106

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT  
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.27190 of 2020 (O&M)

Date of decision: 10.09.2020

Manish Kumar

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

....Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN**

**Present:** Mr. Sunil Agnihotri, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Joginder Pal Ratra, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Naresh Kumar, Advocate for respondent No.2.

**ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN J. (Oral)**

Prayer in this petition is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.0120 dated 11.08.2020 registered under Sections 498-A, 406 IPC at Police Station Hoshiarpur, District Hoshiarpur.

Counsel for the petitioner has argued that as per the allegations in the FIR, the marriage between the parties was solemnized on 04.11.2015 and a son was born out of the wedlock, however, the complainant/wife withdrew from the matrimonial home and started living separately. It is further submitted that the petitioner has filed a petition under Section 9 of the Hindu Marriage Act as he wants restitution of conjugal rights. It is further submitted that the petitioner is ready to live with his wife, however, she is not interested to live with him.

Counsel for the State assisted by counsel for respondent No.2, has submitted that there are serious allegations against the

**CASE HEARD THROUGH VIDEO CONFERENCING**

petitioner that he has repeatedly caused beatings to his wife/complainant under the influence of intoxicants and made her life hell. It is further argued that the wife of the petitioner is residing separately since May, 2019 and the petitioner has filed the petition under Section 9 of the Hindu Marriage Act as he was apprehending arrest in the present FIR.

Counsel for the State assisted by counsel for the respondent No.2 has further submitted that there are specific allegations against the petitioner, who is the husband of the complainant/wife, about causing beatings, extending threats to the family members and colleagues of the complainant, entrustment of dowry articles and then further demand of dowry and maltreatment. Lastly, it is submitted that even the allegation of causing injuries upon the complainant/respondent No.2, are serious in nature.

After hearing the counsel for the parties, considering the serious allegations leveled against the petitioner, I find no ground to grant the concession of bail to the petitioner.

Dismissed.

**(ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN)**  
**JUDGE**

**10.09.2020**  
*yakub*

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No