

**In the High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana
At Chandigarh**

CRM-M-16904-2021 (O&M)
Date of Decision:-28.4.2021

Parminder Singh ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Jagat Vir Dhindsa, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Amar Ashok Pathak, Addl. A.G., Punjab,
assisted by ASI Jagpal.

Mr. R.S. Waraich Rana, Advocate for the complainant.

(proceedings conducted through video conferencing)

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J.(Oral)

1. The petitioner has approached this Court seeking grant of regular bail in respect of a case registered against him vide FIR No.15 dated 12.2.2021 at Police Station Amargarh, District Sangrur under Sections 498-A and 406 of Indian Penal Code and Section 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961.
2. The FIR in question was lodged at the instance of Manpreet Kaur, wherein it is alleged that her marriage was solemnized with Parminder Singh (petitioner) on 21.3.2007 and that a large number of articles of dowry as well as gold ornaments weighing about 43 tolas and an amount of ₹5 lakhs was given at the time of marriage. However, the family of her husband was not

satisfied with the articles of dowry and used to taunt her and also used to harass and maltreat her and raised a demand of car. It is alleged that when the complainant was in the family way, she went to her parental home where a son was born but she was never taken back to her matrimonial home and it was only with the intervention of the *Panchayat* that she was rehabilitated. It is further alleged that subsequently she found that her husband was going around with another girl namely Manpreet Kaur wife of Lakhwinder Singh.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case and that infact it is a case which has arisen out of a petty matrimonial discord and that false allegations have been concocted against the petitioner.
4. Opposing the petition, learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for the complainant has submitted that since the petitioner is specifically named in the FIR and serious allegations of demand of dowry and harassment have been levelled against him, no case for grant of bail is made out. The learned counsel for the complainant has further submitted that since recovery of dowry articles including 43 tolas of gold ornaments is yet to be effected, the petitioner does not deserve the concession of bail. The learned State counsel has, however, informed that the petitioner as on date has been behind bars since the last about 2 months and that challan is yet to be filed. It has also been informed that the other co-accused i.e. father-in-law of the complainant has already been released on regular bail.
5. I have considered rival submissions addressed before this Court.
6. Having regard to the nature of allegations and the fact that the matter infact appears to have arisen out of some kind of matrimonial discord and the

petitioner has already been behind bars since the last about 2 months and is not even stated to be involved in any other case, further detention of the petitioner will not serve any useful purpose. The petition, as such, is accepted and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned Trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned.

28.4.2021

pankaj

**(Gurvinder Singh Gill)
Judge**

Whether speaking /reasoned Yes / No

Whether Reportable Yes / No