



1

CRM-M-25307-2024

215

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-25307-2024
Date of Decision: 31.07.2024

MANJINDER SINGH

.. Petitioner

Vs.

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER

..Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. Ramneek Vasudeva, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Adhiraj Singh Thind, AAG, Punjab.
Ms. Urvashi Singh, Legal Aid Counsel for respondent No.2.

...

SUMEET GOEL, J. (Oral)

1. This petition has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.33 dated 29.06.2023 registered for offences punishable under Sections 498-A IPC (Section 406 of IPC added later on) at Police Station Sadar Morinda, District Rupnagar.

2. On 24.06.2024, the following order was passed:

“Apprehending his arrest in FIR No.33 dated 29.06.2023 registered for offences punishable under Sections 498-A IPC (Section 406 of IPC added later on) at Police Station Sadar Morinda, District Rupnagar; the petitioner has preferred this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. seeking pre-arrest bail.

Inter alia contends that the petitioner was granted the concession of anticipatory bail by this Court on 08.02.2024 in respect of offence under Section 498-A whereinafter the offence of Section 406 was added on 03.05.2024; the petitioner has always been joining investigation and cooperating therein in accordance with law; there has been no complaint against the petitioner for having misusing the concession of anticipatory bail earlier granted to the petitioner for offence under Section 498-A; petitioner is willing for an amicable settlement with the complainant & petitioner is willing to join investigation and cooperate therein in accordance with law.



CRM-M-25307-2024

Adjourned to 18.07.2024.

The petitioner is directed to appear before the Investigating Officer on 27.6.2024 at 11:00 A.M. in concerned police station and join investigation. In the event of arrest, the petitioner shall be released on interim bail subject to his furnishing personal/surety bond(s) to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer/Investigating Officer. As and when further called by Investigating Officer, the petitioner shall join the investigation. He shall abide by the condition(s) enumerated under Section 438(2) of the Cr.P.C.

The parties (through respective counsel) are directed to appear before the Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court on 01.07.2024. On that day the petitioner shall furnish an amount of Rs. 40,000/- to the complainant.

This interim order shall enure in respect of the newly added offences under Sections 406 IPC as also 201 of IPC.”

3. Learned State counsel, on instructions from SI Inderjit Singh, has stated that pursuant to the order dated 24.06.2024, the petitioner has joined investigation and is no longer required for custodial interrogation. However, learned State counsel as also the learned counsel for the complainant have submitted that only partial recovery of dowry articles has been effected and remaining dowry articles are yet to be recovered.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that no dowry articles/Istri-dhan as alleged are in possession of the petitioner.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the rival parties and have perused the paper book.

6. It will be apposite to refer to a judgment dated 12.02.2024 passed by this Court in CRM-M-60647-2023 titled as **“Varun Sharma Vs. State of Punjab and another”**, relevant whereof reads as under:

“11. As a sequel to the above said discussion, the following principles of law emerge:-

(I) Non-recovery of dowry articles/Istri-dhan cannot ordinarily be a ground, by itself, for declining a

**CRM-M-25307-2024**

plea for grant of anticipatory bail to the husband or his relatives.

(II) The conduct of an accused, is indeed, a relevant factor for consideration of a plea for grant of anticipatory bail on behalf of such accused. Such conduct would also include the cooperation, in accordance with law, extended by such accused for recovery of dowry articles/Istri-dhan. Whether or not such cooperation was extended by the accused would be ascertainable from the facts and circumstances of a given case.

(III) In exceptional cases, if the peculiar and/or accentuating facts/circumstances of the case so warrant, a Court would be well within its discretion to pass a direction to the petitioner- accused to deposit in Court or remit to the complainant-wife an appropriate amount towards the Istri-dhan/dowry articles. Needless to state herein that it is neither possible nor desirable to enumerate a set of guidelines in this regard & a Court would have to exercise its judicial discretion in this regard in the facts and circumstances of a given case.”

7. Non-recovery of dowry articles/Istridhan in entirety thereof cannot, by itself, be a cause for rejection of the present plea for anticipatory bail by the petitioner especially when the State does not require custodial interrogation of petitioner on any other count except for effecting recovery of remaining dowry articles/Istridhan. The aspect, as to what all are the dowry articles/Istridhan in question in the present case & whether the entire dowry articles have been recovered or not, shall be essentially gone into during the course of trial. No accentuating circumstances are decipherable, from the factual matrix of the present case, so as to direct the petitioner to deposit any amount towards the alleged non-recovery of complete dowry articles. No such misconduct by the petitioner has been pointed out which may dissuade this Court from confirming the interim anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

CRM-M-25307-2024

8. In view of above, the petition is allowed and interim order dated 24.06.2024 passed by this Court is made absolute, subject to the conditions as enumerated under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.
9. This order should not be treated as “blanket” order. It will not be interpreted as granting petitioner indefinite protection from arrest. It shall be confined to the FIR mentioned *ibid* and will not operate in respect of any other incident that involves commission of an offence.
10. Liberty is reserved in favour of State/complainant to move for cancellation/recall of this order in case the petitioner violates any condition stipulated under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C., 1973 or upon showing any other sufficient cause.
11. Needless to say that anything observed herein above shall not be construed to be an opinion on the merits of the case.
12. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed off.

31.07.2024

Jasmine Kaur

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes	No
Whether reportable	Yes	No