

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

CRM-M- 17638-2021 (O&M)

Date of Decision: May 24, 2021

(Heard through VC)

Ranjeet Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JAISHREE THAKUR

Present:- Mr. Baldev Singh Dhillon, Advocate
for the petitioner.
Ms. Deepshikha Chauhan, AAG, Haryana
Mr. Sandeep Bansal, Advocate
for the complainant.

JAISHREE THAKUR, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No. 43 dated 24.02.2021, registered under Sections 323, 377, 406, 498-A of Indian Penal Code at Police Station City Pehowa, District Kurukshetra.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner would contend that the petitioner is serving in Indian Army since 2003 and has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is further contended that the FIR in question has in fact been lodged by the complainant wife with an oblique motive so as to put pressure upon him to buy a house at Pehowa, District Kurukshetra. Consequently, a prayer is made for grant of anticipatory bail to him.

3. Notice of motion was issued and an appearance had been caused on behalf of the respondent-State and the complainant. Learned counsel for the

respondents would point out that the conduct of the petitioner proves that he is not entitled for any discretionary relief from this Court. It is argued that the petitioner has already been issued many warnings by his superiors regarding the complaints made against him by the complainant wife regarding committing domestic violence, consuming liquor etc along with the fact that there is medical evidence available on record regarding allegations of committing of offence under Section 377 IPC. It is further pointed out that the petitioner has even failed to put in appearance in the proceedings initiated under the Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act as well as under Section 125 Cr.P.C. It is further pointed out that the necessary affidavit appended with the petition has not been signed by the petitioner and in fact it is signed by his father Balkar Singh.

4. I have heard counsel for the parties and have gone through the pleadings of the case and found that this is not a case where any relief can be granted to the petitioner herein given the fact that earlier too the petitioner has had a warning order issued by the higher authorities of the Indian Army regarding his misbehavior towards the complainant, who is none other but his wife. The conduct of the petitioner does not allow this Court to exercise its discretionary jurisdiction in allowing anticipatory bail to him.

5. The petition is dismissed.

May 24, 2021
seema

(JAISHREE THAKUR)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No