

CRM-M-12913-2023

-1-

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

368

CRM-M-12913-2023

Date of decision : 13.04.2023

Vishal Sondhi

..... Petitioner

V/S

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE AMARJOT BHATTI

Present: Mr. Anirudh Gupta, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Kunwarbir Singh, Assistant A.G.Punjab.

Mr. Subhash Ahuja, Advocate for the complainant.

AMARJOT BHATTI J. (ORAL)

The petitioner-Vishal Sondhi has filed the instant petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. seeking anticipatory bail in FIR No. 0002 dated 24.01.2023, under Sections 406, 498-A of IPC, registered at Police Station Women, District Amritsar.

The facts of the case are that the complainant-Kanika filed a written complaint against Vishal Sondhi, alleging that her marriage was solemnized with Vishal Sondhi on 11.12.2017. Her father had spent Rs.3 lacs at the time of reception of the *Barat*. A huge amount was spent on various ceremonies. They were given gold ornaments, cash amount, boxes of sweets etc. In March 2019, she became pregnant. Her husband was unhappy with this news and told her to abort the child. She refused to this suggestion and for this reason she was ill-treated. The accused No.1 extracted money from her parents from time to time and told her that her parents should fulfill his demands. She again conceived and due to the ill-treatment she gave birth to a premature baby. The said child could not be saved. Her husband used to consume liquor, he used to demand money

from time to time. Thereafter he started raising demand for *Honda City* car, cash of Rs.10 lakhs and a plot of 200 sq. yds. He used to blackmail her whenever she was to go to her parental house by raising various demands. He insulted her father, her brother and Chetan Batra. They were turned out of the house by insulting them. Ultimately the matter was reported to the police and after due enquiry, the present FIR has been registered.

Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that he is falsely implicated in this case. Their marriage was performed in a simple manner and no dowry article was given. The dispute had started due to differences in temperament. After marriage, a baby boy was born on 17.08.2018 but unfortunately the child expired on 27.08.2018 and because of this reason, the dispute started. It was the complainant who never showed any interest in the household activities. He tried to accommodate her and save his relationship. He is ready to join the investigation. His anticipatory bail application was wrongly declined by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Amritsar. The copy of said order is Annexure P-2. It is prayed that his anticipatory bail application may be allowed.

The bail application is opposed by learned counsel representing the complainant.

Learned State counsel has filed the status report, which is taken on record. It is argue that the petitioner had joined the investigation on 31.01.2023 but he did not cooperate with the investigating officer. Not even a single dowry article has been recovered. He is not entitled to the concession of anticipatory bail.

I have considered the arguments and have gone through the record.

As per the version of complainant, her parents had given dowry articles, gold

CRM-M-12913-2023

-3-

ornaments and cash Shagun as detailed in the FIR. The status report indicates that when the petitioner was called to join the investigation, he did not cooperate and not even a single dowry article was recovered. The dowry articles given to the complainant at the time of marriage are her *Istridhan* and it is a case property for the offence under Section 406 IPC.

Considering, the aforesaid facts and the conduct of the petitioner, in my opinion he is not entitled to the relief of anticipatory bail and the same is accordingly declined.

(AMARJOT BHATTI)
JUDGE

13.04.2023.
Sunil Devi

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