

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

**CRM-M No.7486 of 2023
Date of Decision: 30.10.2023**

Ranjit Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab & another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA

Present:- Mr. Sandeep Godara, Advocate, appearing for
Mr. Ajay Pal Singh Rehan, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Gurlal Singh Dhillon, AAG, Punjab,
for respondent No.1-State.

Mr. Kunal Sarangal, Advocate, appearing for
Mr. Raj Kumar Arya, Advocate,
for respondent No.2-complainant.

* * * *

MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA, J.(ORAL)

By way of the instant petition, the petitioner has sought the relief of pre-arrest/anticipatory bail in the criminal case arisen out of the FIR bearing No.63 dated 08.05.2022 registered at Police Station Dhariwal, District Gurdaspur, under Sections 498-A & 120-B IPC.

2. It is worth-while to mention here that vide the order passed by the Co-ordinate Bench on 13.02.2023, the petitioner was granted the relief of interim anticipatory bail, with the direction to join the investigation.

3. On 02.05.2023, learned State counsel had apprised the Court that though the petitioner did join in the investigation but the recovery was

still to be affected from him and hence, the Co-ordinate Bench directed him (petitioner) to re-join the investigation.

4. On 31.05.2023, learned counsel for the petitioner and also for respondent No.2 requested for referring the present matter to the Mediation & Conciliation Centre of this Court so as to explore the possibility of some amicable settlement between their respective clients and accordingly, the parties had been directed to appear before the above-said Centre and the petitioner had also been directed to pay an amount of Rs.35,000/- to the respondent-wife, towards the litigation and travelling expenses, on her appearance before the Mediator.

5. As mentioned in the order passed by this Court on 28.07.2023, learned counsel for respondent No.2-wife had submitted that the petitioner did not pay the afore-said amount to the said respondent in compliance of the order dated 31.05.2023 and learned State counsel had also informed the Court that though the petitioner had joined the investigation but he did not co-operate with the Investigation Agency and then, on the request of his learned counsel, the petitioner was again directed to join the investigation. Learned counsel for the petitioner had also submitted that he intended to move an application for adding the offences under Sections 406 and 201 IPC in this petition, as the same had been invoked in the case subsequently.

6. Today, learned State counsel, on the instructions from ASI Yusuf Masih from the above-referred Police Station, apprises the Court that the petitioner had joined in the investigation but he had again not co-operated in the said proceedings because he did not get the recovery of

the 'Istridhan' of respondent No.2-wife, including her gold jewellery items, affected. Learned counsel appearing for the said respondent submits that the petitioner has not yet paid the sum of Rs.35,000/- to his client.

7. From the afore-discussed facts and circumstances, it becomes explicit that the petitioner has failed to co-operate with the Investigating Agency and has also not paid the above-said amount to respondent No.2-wife in compliance of the afore-said order, despite his having been afforded more than sufficient opportunities for these purposes and it being so, this Court is of the considered opinion that he (petitioner) does not deserve the concession of anticipatory/pre-arrest bail. Resultantly, the petition in hand stands dismissed.

30.10.2023
seema

(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes
Whether Reportable:	No