

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

CRM-M No.38740 of 2021 (O&M)

Date of Decision:28.09.2021

(Heard through VC)

Saurabh Garg

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

...Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JAISHREE THAKUR

Present:- Mr. Sherry Singla, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Deepshikha Chauhan, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Arav Gupta, Advocate
for the complainant.

JAISHREE THAKUR, J. (ORAL)

This is a petition that has been filed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.62 dated 25.08.2021 registered under Sections 498-A, 406 and 506 read with Section 34 IPC at Women Police Station, Fatehabad.

The FIR came to be registered by the complainant against the petitioner/husband Saurabh Garg and his family members on an allegation that she was being harassed on account of inadequate dowry being given. Out of the wedlock, one son was born on 17.03.2019 and on his first birthday, there was a demand of ₹1 lakh made, which was given to the petitioner and his family members. Thereafter, there was another demand of ₹1.5 lakhs to start a new business by the petitioner, which amount was again given. There was continuous demand for more money and the petitioner herein threatened the complainant that he would commit suicide in case

demand was not fulfilled and would implicate the petitioner and her family members. When she went to her paternal home to celebrate *rakhi*, she was told that her husband had tried to commit suicide and when she reached back, there was no such incident. A panchayat was held in which father of the petitioner had agreed to transfer a shop in the name of the complainant so that the complainant and her husband could reside separately, however, the said shop was also sold out.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner would contend false implication as no specific role has been attributed to the petitioner and his family members. The instant FIR has been registered to mount pressure on the petitioner and his family members to transfer the shop in the name of the complainant. The petitioner herein is ready to join investigation and therefore, prays for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

Reply filed on behalf of the respondent-State in which it has been stated that the allegations levelled against the petitioner herein are serious in nature and therefore, his custodial interrogation would be required.

Appearance has been caused on behalf of the complainant, who would submit that the complainant was continuously harassed on account of demand of dowry and an amount of ₹20 lakhs had been spent on the marriage, which could be substantiated by withdrawals made from the bank accounts.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have perused the paper book and also perused the reply filed by the State. The allegations

as made out in the FIR against the petitioner are serious in nature for which custodial interrogation of the petitioner would be required. Consequently, the instant petition stands dismissed.

September 28, 2021
Pankaj*

(JAISHREE THAKUR)
JUDGE

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