

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

Sr. No. 206

CRM-M-41431-2021

Date of decision : 08.03.2022

Rahul Dhingra

..... Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab and another

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK SIBAL

Present: Mr.Yogesh Goel, Advocate, for the petitioner.  
Mr.Saurav Khurana, DAG, Punjab.

\*\*\*\*\*

DEEPAK SIBAL, J. (ORAL)

The matter has been taken up through video conferencing

Through the present petition filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. the petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in FIR No.100 dated 27.07.2021 registered under Sections 498-A and 406 IPC at Police Station Division No.1, District Pathankot.

On a complaint filed by his wife the petitioner is being prosecuted for cruelty and breach of trust as also for demanding dowry.

Seeking anticipatory bail for the petitioner, learned counsel submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case at the behest of the complainant due to a matrimonial discord between them; the petitioner has no other criminal case pending against him; the documentary evidence, which includes photographs etc., which have already been placed on the record clearly shows that the petitioner has treated the complainant with love and affection; it was the complainant who could not adjust with the petitioner and his family; the complainant has taken her entire *istridhan* with her; in the mediation proceedings it was the complainant who was not willing to compromise the matter; the petitioner has joined the investigation on several occasions and that the investigation in this case is complete.

Learned State counsel submits that the petitioner has joined the investigation but opposes grant of bail to the petitioner on the ground that recovery of gold articles is still required to be made from him.

After considering the afore rival submissions and in particular the fact that the petitioner is not involved in any other criminal case; he has joined the investigation on several occasions and that the investigation in this case is complete, this Court is of the considered opinion that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not warranted. Accordingly, the order of this Court dated 04.10.2021, granting ad interim anticipatory bail to the petitioner is directed to be made absolute.

08.03.2022  
shamsher

[DEEPAK SIBAL]  
JUDGE

|                           |   |          |
|---------------------------|---|----------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned | : | Yes / No |
| Whether reportable        | : | Yes / No |