

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

CRM-M-37275-2021

Date of Decision: 10.2.2022

Vipan Kumar

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Naveen Bawa, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Rakeshinder Singh Sidhu,
Assistant Advocate General, Punjab.
Mr. Nitin Sachdeva, Advocate, for respondent No.2.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J. (ORAL)

Matter has been taken up through video conferencing via Webex facility in the light of the Pandemic Covid-19 situation and as per instructions.

Prayer in the present petition is for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in a case FIR No.56 dated 4.6.2021, registered under Sections 406, 498-A IPC, at Police Station Women, District Ludhiana.

At the time of consideration of the arguments for the interim protection, it was projected before this Court that the petitioner is keen to settle the dispute amicably with his wife and the allegations in the FIR are totally false. The impression given to this Court was that he has every intention to reconcile the issue with his wife and he would honour the order passed by this Court, if the interim protection is granted. In the facts and circumstances and taking into consideration the nature of the case and assertions made by learned counsel for the petitioner, this Court granted interim protection to the petitioner vide order dated 9.9.2021. Keeping in

view his status, litigation expenses of Rs.20,000/- was directed to be paid to the complainant. Thereafter, when the case came for hearing on 15.12.2021, it was vehemently opposed by counsel for the complainant that though the petitioner has joined the investigation but he has no intention to own the responsibility of his wife and son. It was submitted that despite opportunities being granted to him, he has flatly refused to give the litigation expenses. However, in the interest of justice, the case was again adjourned for today i.e. 10.2.2022.

It has been brought to the notice of the Court that the joining part of the petitioner is only to a facade, however, neither he is cooperating with investigating agency nor is honouring the order passed by this Court and till date he has not paid the litigation expenses. Even today, I have heard both the counsel at length. Despite the opportunities being given, the Court finds that neither the petitioner has any intention to settle the dispute amicably nor he is ready to honour the order passed by this Court. In the overall facts and circumstances of the case, I find no ground to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

10.2.2022
sharmila

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No