

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

CRM-M-22282-2020

Date of decision:09.03.2021

Raghuvir Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Karanjeet Singh Brar, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Ramandeep Sandhu, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Damanjeet Bhoriwal, Advocate for the complainant.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

Case is taken up for hearing through video conferencing.

Through this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C., the petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No.89 dated 28.05.2020 registered under Sections 498-A and 406 IPC at Police Station Kotbhai, District Shri Muktsar Sahib.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that the marriage between the petitioner and the complainant was solemnized on 09.12.2018, but the complainant left her matrimonial home in July, 2019. The complainant is well educated and working as a Personal Assistant to the Dean of Baba Farid Group of Institution, District Bathinda and she filed a complaint against the petitioner in December, 2019 whereas, the FIR was registered on 28.05.2020. The co-accused of the petitioner have already been granted the concession of anticipatory bail.

Learned State counsel assisted by the counsel for the

complainant, states that there are specific allegations of harassment and maltreatment given by the petitioner to the complainant, besides usurpation of the dowry articles. It is further submitted that during the proceedings before the Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court, the petitioner did not show any desire for an amicable settlement of the matter, and hence, the petitioner, who is none other than the husband of the complainant, is not entitled to be released on the anticipatory bail.

Vide order dated 15.12.2020 passed by this Court, the parties were directed to appear before the Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court for settling the issue between them. However, as per the report of the Mediator, despite best efforts, the parties could not reach an amicable settlement.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties.

Vide order dated 11.08.2020 passed by a Coordinate Bench of this Court, the arrest of the petitioner was stayed, but the petitioner was directed to join the investigation and hand over the dowry articles to the Investigating Officer. On 18.09.2020, when the matter came up for hearing, the learned State counsel made a statement that the petitioner though had joined the investigation, yet he was not cooperating with the Investigating Agency.

As noticed above, vide order dated 15.12.2020, the matter was relegated to the Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court, but no amicable settlement could be reached between the parties.

In view of the above, this Court is of the opinion that no more indulgence is required to be granted to the petitioner as despite having been

given sufficient opportunities to hand over the dowry articles and find an amicable settlement of the issue, no fruitful endeavour seems to have been made.

No ground is made to grant the anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

Dismissed.

09.03.2021

ishwar

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No