

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

101

CRM-M-14390-2024(O&M)

Date of order: 20.03.2024

Anuradha

.....Petitioner(s)

Vs.

State of Haryana & Another

.....Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON’BLE MS. JUSTICE NIDHI GUPTA

Present:- Mr. Samar Pratap Singh Ahluwalia, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ranvir Singh Arya, AAG Haryana.

Nidhi Gupta, J.

Prayer in the present petition filed by the complainant under Section 439(2) Cr.P.C. is for cancellation of bail granted to the accused-Gaurav son of Ashok Kumar (respondent No.2) vide order dated 23.01.2023 (Annexure P3) in case FIR No.622 dated 10.11.2023 registered under Sections 323, 498-A and 506 IPC at Police Station Ambala City (Annexure P1) on the ground that he has violated the conditions of bail.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner inter alia submits that the petitioner was married to respondent No.2 on 24.11.2020. It is submitted that specific allegations have been made against respondent No.2 in the present FIR to the effect that he had beaten and tortured the petitioner and had also abused the parents of the petitioner. It is submitted that the petitioner had made specific allegations that on 23.09.2023 at about 7 pm, she had received a phone call from a particular number from

some unknown person who had said that he is a policeman and the said person had threatened the petitioner as well as her brother on phone. It is submitted that a similar threatening phone call was received on 25.09.2023. It is stated that however, in the impugned order dated 18.12.2023 (Annexure P3), the above allegations have not been referred to by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ambala while granting bail to respondent No.2. It is further submitted that respondent No.2 has misused the concession of bail.

3. When questioned by this Court as to in what manner respondent No.2 has misused the concession of bail, learned counsel for the petitioner is unable to substantiate his allegations. Accordingly, said contention on part of the petitioner is rejected.

4. As regards the first contention of the petitioner that respondent No.2 used to make dowry demands from the petitioner and her parents etc., perusal of FIR shows that the allegations made therein are purely general in nature. As regards dowry demands, there is nothing stated in the FIR and no details provided in the FIR as to any specific date, time or place where entrustment of dowry articles was made by the petitioner or her family to respondent No.2.

5. As regards second contention made on part of the petitioner about receiving anonymous phone calls, the same have no bearing on anticipatory bail granted to respondent No.2. Besides that, learned State Counsel has informed that investigation in that respect is still

going on. Learned State Counsel has further informed on instructions that respondent No.2 has joined investigation on 08.01.2024.

6. In view of the above, I find no merit in the present petition and the same is accordingly **dismissed**.

7. Pending application(s) if any also stand(s) disposed of.

20.03.2024

Sunena

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No

(Nidhi Gupta)
Judge