

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

241

**CRM-M-3496-2021
Date of decision: 20.09.2021**

Kiran

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present : Ms. Varuna Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Gagandeep Singh Chhina, AAG, Haryana assisted by
ASI Balvir.
for respondent No.1-State.

Mr. Deepak Singh Saini, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

(Through Video Conferencing)

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

The petitioner is seeking cancellation of bail which had been extended to respondent No.2, in case FIR No.144 dated 25.10.2020 registered under Sections 323, 406, 498-A and 120-B of the IPC at Police Station Sector-20, Panchkula, by the trial Court vide order dated 06.01.2021.

It has been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the learned trial Court passed the impugned order without appreciating that there were serious and specific allegations levelled against respondent No.2 of subjecting her to physical and mental torture for bringing insufficient dowry.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has further contended that the trial Court also failed to appreciate that the dowry articles had

not been recovered and returned to the petitioner. He has further submitted that even though the Public Prosecutor apprised the trial Court that respondent No.2 had not cooperated in the investigation and failed to return the dowry articles, yet respondent No.2 was extended the concession of bail with the observations that non-recovery of dowry articles could not be a ground for denial of bail.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties as well as perused the material on record including the impugned order.

Bail once granted should not be cancelled unless some cogent case based on some supervening circumstance is brought to the notice of a Court. Learned counsel for the petitioner has failed to bring to the notice of this Court any such supervening circumstances much less violation of any conditions which were imposed upon the petitioner at the time of the passing of the impugned order.

This Court, thus, does not find any illegality much less perversity in the impugned order as bail granted to an accused cannot be simply cancelled because of the non-recovery of some of the dowry articles. Moreover, after completion of the investigation, report under Section 173(2) of the Cr.P.C. already stands presented before the trial Court and charges also stand framed.

Dismissed.

20.09.2021

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

Vinay

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No