

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

103

**CRM-M-1205-2022
Decided on : 13.01.2022**

Ranjeet Singh

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

(Through Video Conferencing)

PRESENT: Mr. Amit Arora, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (Oral)

The present petition has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C., for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, in case FIR No. 87, dated 21.11.2021, lodged under Sections 406, 498-A of IPC and Section 67 of the Information Technology Act, 2000, registered at Police Station Women, District Amritsar.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner and the complainant solemnized their marriage against the wishes of their parents. Thereafter, they approached the District & Sessions Judge, for protection of their life and liberty. Learned counsel submits that thus there was no question of the petitioner subjecting his wife to mental and physical harassment, as alleged by her in the FIR in question. It has also been submitted that in fact, it was on account of a trivial and routine dispute between them that the complainant implicated him in a false case.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and perused the material on record.

As per the allegations levelled in the FIR, there was a

matrimonial dispute going on between the parties. Resultantly, the complainant had approached the police in the said regard and lodged a complaint. The petitioner had ever since then been pressurizing the complainant to withdraw all the cases against him or else face dire consequences. Besides this, the petitioner had been sending obscene and abusive messages along with threats to the complainant from his mobile phone. Learned counsel for the petitioner has very fairly conceded that there was ample evidence on record *qua* the aforementioned messages and threats sent by the petitioner to the complainant from his own mobile phone.

Prima facie, there are serious and specific allegations levelled against the petitioner, which does not seem to be an outcome of a trivial matrimonial dispute between the parties. This Court, in view of the allegations levelled does not deem it fit to extend the extraordinary concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

Dismissed.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

January 13, 2022

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes/No*
Whether Reportable: *Yes/No*