

**CRM-M-29918 of 2024** 1**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH****208****CRM-M-29918 of 2024
DATE OF DECISION :- 14.10.2024****Sandeep Singh****...Petitioner****Versus****State of Punjab****...Respondent****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL****Present:-** Mr. Sandeep Chopra, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Anup Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Vaibhav Sharma, Advocate for the complainant.

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 02.05.2024 registered for offences punishable under Sections 406,498-A IPC at Police Station Women Cell, Patiala.

2. On 05.09.2024, the following order was passed:-

“On 14.08.2024, the following order was passed :-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that there may still be chances of amicable settlement between the parties & hence a request for referring the matter to Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court has been made.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has further submitted that in order to show bona fide, the petitioner is willing to deposit a sum of Rs1.00 lac with the Chief Judicial Magistrate, Patiala.

Keeping in view the totality of the facts and circumstances of the case, the parties (through their respective learned counsel) are directed to appear before the Mediation and Conciliation



Centre of this Court on 21.08.2024 or any other date fixed thereafter for exploring the possibility of amicable settlement. Learned counsel for the parties undertake to assist the said Forum during the proceedings.

Put up on 05.09.2024.

The petitioner is directed to deposit a sum of Rs.1.00 lac with the Chief Judicial Magistrate, Patiala before the said date and produce receipt/order showing such deposit before this Court.

Interim order to continue till the next date of hearing.”

The mediation proceedings initiated between the parties has not fructified. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that petitioner has already deposited a sum of Rs. 1 lakh with the Chief Judicial Magistrate, Patiala in terms of the order dated 14.08.2024.

Apprehending his arrest in FIR No. 33 dated 02.05.2024 registered for offences punishable under Sections 406,498-A IPC at Police Station Women Cell, Patiala; the petitioner has preferred this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. seeking pre-arrest bail.

Adjourned to 14.10.2024.

The petitioner is directed to appear before the Investigating Officer on 10.09.2024 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 Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.”

3. Learned State counsel, on instructions from HC Rahul Kumar, has stated that pursuant to the order dated 05.09.2024, 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/Istridhan are in possession of the petitioner and, in fact, the entire dowry articles/Istridhan is with the aggrieved-wife.

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 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.

8. In view of above, the petition is allowed and interim order dated 05.09.2024 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.

13. The petitioner has earlier deposited a sum of Rs. 1 lakh with CJM, Patiala in terms of the order dated 14.08.2024 earlier passed by this



Court. The CJM, Patiala is directed to release the said amount of Rs.1 lakh to the complainant on due identification.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

14.10.2024
P.Singh

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