

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

208

CRM-M-54376-2021

Date of decision : 26.04.2023

Amandeep Singh

..... Petitioner

V/S

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE AMARJOT BHATTI

Present: Mr. Arjun Dhingra, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Ambika Sood, Additional A.G. Haryana.

AMARJOT BHATTI J. (ORAL)

The petitioner-Amandeep Singh has filed the instant petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. seeking anticipatory bail in FIR No. 275 dated 31.10.2021, under Sections 498-A, 406, 323, 506, 34 of IPC, registered at Women Police Station NIT Faridabad, District Faridabad.

The facts of the case are that the complainant - Amanpreet Kaur filed a written complaint against her husband and in-laws family for maltreatment given to her on account of their demand of dowry. She got married with Amandeep Singh on 05.03.2016. After five days of her marriage, they took rented accommodation in Faridabad as her husband was working in Noida. There was change in the behaviour of her husband and all the time he was angry on petty

issues. He used to come late at home. He used to consume liquor and was abusing. He even gave her beating. She was physically and mentally tortured. She did not have a child out of this wedlock. He started raising demand of Rs.2 lacs. She tried to save her married life. She lived in her in-laws house, even there she was ill-treated. Ultimately, she filed the complaint on the basis of which present FIR has been registered.

Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that the petitioner was granted interim bail by this court vide order dated 05.01.2022. He has already joined the investigation. Even the dowry articles have been recovered. He will abide by the terms of the bail order. Therefore, his anticipatory bail application may be allowed.

The bail application is opposed by learned State counsel as well as the counsel for the complainant. Learned State counsel has already filed status report, in which it is mentioned that the petitioner has joined investigation and some of the dowry articles are recovered as per recovery memo (Annexure R-2). It is further alleged that some of the gold and silver ornaments are yet to be recovered. Therefore, the petitioner is not entitled to the concession of anticipatory bail.

I have considered the arguments and have gone through the record. The aforesaid facts clearly indicate that the petitioner has already joined the investigation and some of the dowry articles are recovered, as per recovery memo placed on record. It is claimed that some of the dowry articles are yet to be recovered. So far as the remaining recovery of dowry articles or its misappropriation is concerned that is matter of trial. The petitioner has already

joined the investigation, considering this fact, the ad-interim bail already granted in favour of the petitioner vide order dated 05.01.2022 stands confirmed subject to the conditions enshrined under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

The petition is accordingly accepted.

(AMARJOT BHATTI)
JUDGE

26.04.2023.
Sunil Devi

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