

104

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-47132-2021

Date of Decision: November 10, 2021

Bikramjit Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr.Amit Arora, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms.Ruchika Sabharwal, DAG, Punjab.

Mr.Veneet Sharma, Advocate for the complainant.

.....

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J.

Instant petition has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. praying for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.96, dated 17.09.2021, under Sections 494, 498-A, 34 IPC, registered at Police Station Verowal, District Tarn Taran.

As per the factual matrix of the case, the FIR in question was registered by the complainant-Gagandeep Kaur alleging that she is married with the petitioner and after the marriage the petitioner and her in-laws started harassing her on account of demand of dowry. She alleged that she was given beatings and continuously they used to demand dowry. Not only this, it is contended that the husband performed second marriage with one Kamalpreet Kaur without even getting divorce from her. FIR was lodged for taking the legal action against the accused. Apprehending the arrest, the petitioner approached the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Tarn Taran for grant of anticipatory bail, who after hearing the same, declined it vide order

dated 18.10.2021. Aggrieved by the same, the petitioner approached this Court.

Counsel for the petitioner contends that the allegations are false and frivolous and no offence, as alleged, is made out against the petitioner. He submits that even if the allegations of second marriage are taken to be true, then the same is bailable offence and hence, no case for custodial interrogation is made out and the petitioner deserves to be granted the benefit of anticipatory bail.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

It is apparent from the bare reading of the FIR that there were specific allegations against the petitioner, who is the husband of the complainant. There are allegations of continuous demand of dowry and she was beaten time and again. Not only this, there is a specific allegation qua petitioner having contracted the second marriage with one Kamalpreet Kaur. It is also alleged that a compromise also took place between the parties on the conditions of transferring some property in the name of the complainant but the same was not even honoured.

In the overall facts and circumstances, the conduct of the petitioner does not qualify for granting the extraordinary relief of anticipatory bail.

The petition being devoid of any merit is, hereby, dismissed.

November 10, 2021

meenuss

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)

JUDGE

1. Whether speaking/reasoned ?

Yes/No

2. Whether reportable ?

Yes/No