



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-2931-2024 (O&M)
Reserved on: 12th August 2024
Date of decision: 22nd October 2024

BIKRAMJEET SINGHPetitioner

versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHERRespondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE HARPREET KAUR JEEWAN

Present: Mr. Karandeep Singh Sidhu, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Sakshi Bakshi, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Tajinder Pal Singh Makkar, Advocate and
Ms. Simran Chhabra, Advocate
for the complainant.

HARPREET KAUR JEEWAN, J.

1. The instant first petition has been filed under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 seeking anticipatory bail in case FIR No.80 dated 25.09.2023, under Sections 354-B, 406, 323, 148, 149 IPC, 1860 (Sections 307, 328 IPC added later on vide Rapat No.33 dated 16.10.2023), registered at Police Station Lakho Ke Behram, District Ferozepur (Annexure P-1).
2. As per the prosecution version, on 21.09.2023, respondent No.2-wife of the petitioner was present along with the minor daughter in her parental house. On 21.09.2024, the petitioner invited the complainant-wife as well as his daughter to his house on the occasion of birthday of his daughter. When the complainant, along with her daughter, went to her matrimonial house, the co-accused of the petitioner inflicted various injuries to the complainant. The petitioner also made an attempt to administer a poisonous substance to the complainant. The complainant



clothes. She tried to rescue herself but the main door of the house was closed and she was overpowered by the petitioner and his relatives. She was again inflicted various injuries. The complainant and her daughter were thrown in the street and she informed her brother-Lovepreet Singh about the incident, who came there on a motorcycle and took his sister to the hospital.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the marriage of the petitioner was solemnized with the complainant on 01.09.2013. However, due to strained relations, the complainant, along with her daughter, left her matrimonial house in the year 2015. Thereafter, she did not come back to her matrimonial house. The complainant had also filed a petition under the Domestic Violence Act as well as a petition seeking maintenance but the same was withdrawn by her thereafter. It is further contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. No offence under Section 307 IPC is made out against the petitioner. The co-accused of the petitioner have already been granted bail.

3.1 Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the complainant, along with her relatives, had tried to administer a poisonous substance to the petitioner, as such, he has filed a complaint against the complainant-wife and her relatives seeking registration of the FIR by invoking the provisions of Section 156(3) Cr.P.C.

3.2 Copy of the order dated 29.02.2024, passed by the Area Magistrate, has been submitted in the Court today, which is taken on record. It is further contended that this is a case of version and cross-version.

4. Learned State counsel as well as the learned counsel for the complainant have opposed the present petition on the ground of gravity of allegations levelled against the petitioner. It is submitted that the complainant had



suffered 07 injuries on her person, as per the Medico Legal Examination, which was conducted on 22.09.2023.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant documents.

6. There are serious allegations against the petitioner that he, along with his relatives, had inflicted 07 injuries to the complainant-wife when she visited her matrimonial home along with her minor daughter, who is 08 years old. Initially, keeping in view the emotions of an 8-year old minor child and the relationship of the petitioner with the minor child, the matter was referred to the Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court vide order dated 19.01.2024 and the complainant-wife was impleaded as respondent No.2 in the said petition. However, as per the report of the Mediator dated 30.04.2024, mediation failed.

7. As per the order dated 07.05.2024, the petitioner again sought an accommodation to bring a demand draft of Rs.10,00,000/- in favour of the minor child to show his *bona fide* and thereafter, the matter was again referred to the Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court. Despite another accommodation, the said demand draft in favour of the minor child was not produced by the petitioner.

8. Fresh report from the Mediation and Conciliation Centre has been received, as per which, mediation proceedings have failed.

9. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case and also in view of the allegations levelled against the petitioner that as many as 07 injuries were inflicted on the person of the complainant-wife when she visited her matrimonial house along with the minor child, that too on the invitation of the petitioner, it is not a fit case to grant the concession of anticipatory bail to the

11. Pending miscellaneous applications, if any, shall stand disposed of.

22nd October 2024
simran

SIMRANDEEP KAUR
2024.10.23 13:06
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this order/judgment.