

305

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-16827-2022

Date of Decision:- 25.04.2023

Harish Kumar

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM:-HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE AMARJOT BHATTI

Present: Mr. Raj Kumar Karanwal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. M.S.Joshi, Addl. A.G. Punjab.

Mr. Vishal Deep Goyal, Advocate
for the complainant.

AMARJOT BHATTI, J. (Oral)

The petitioner – Harish Kumar has filed this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No. 50 dated 08.03.2022, under Section 498-A and 406 of IPC, registered at Police Station City Sangrur.

The facts of the case are that the complainant – Shweta Bhardwaj filed written complaint against her husband and in-laws family alleging the maltreatment given to her in the matrimonial home on account of their demand for dowry. She got married with Harish Kumar on 19.10.2019. The marriage of her brother was performed on 07.12.2019. She was ill-treated in the matrimonial home on account of their various demands. Her mother-in-law raised demand for a gold ring for attending the marriage of her brother. Even during pregnancy, she was ill-treated. She gave birth to a daughter on

07.09.2020. On 08.10.2020, her father arranged function and the entire

family was invited. Her husband noticed a new car given to her brother. Thereafter, he started harassing her on account of his demand. He even had a scuffle with her father. She was also beaten up and ill-treated. Ultimately, she was brought back in her parental house and the matter was reported to the police.

Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that all the allegations levelled against him are false. Even otherwise, he has joined the investigation and has handed over the dowry articles. He is ready to abide by the terms of bail order.

The learned counsel representing the complainant opposed the bail order on the ground that some of the dowry articles are yet to be recovered. The State counsel however alleged that the petitioner has joined investigation on 12.05.2022 and also placed on record copy of recovery memo vide which the dowry articles were taken into police possession. It is further claimed that some of the dowry articles are yet to be recovered.

I have considered the arguments and have gone through the record carefully. The petitioner was granted *ad interim* bail as per order dated 25.04.2022. He has already joined the investigation. The dowry articles are recovered. In case some of the dowry articles are left, then it is matter of trial. As far now, the petitioner is not required for any other purpose. Considering these facts, the *ad interim* bail already granted in favour of petitioner – Harish Kumar vide order dated 25.04.2022 stands confirmed, subject to the conditions enshrined under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

The petition is accordingly, accepted.

25.04.2023

lalit

(AMARJOT BHATTI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:
Whether reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No