



101

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-36637-2024 (O&M)
Date of decision: 01.08.2024

Keshav Jain

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Vishal Deep Goyal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Subhash Godara, Addl. A.G., Punjab.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

1. This second petition has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. seeking anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No.180 dated 25.05.2024 under Sections 306, 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (for short 'IPC') (Section 304-B of IPC added later on), registered at Police Station City Kharar, District SAS Nagar.
2. The first petition i.e. CRM-M-35239-2024 filed by the petitioner for grant of anticipatory bail was dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 25.07.2024 with liberty to file a fresh petition on the same cause of action by adding the offence under Section 304-B of IPC.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner, *inter alia*, contends that it was a simple marriage between the petitioner and the deceased. In fact, the



deceased belongs to a very poor family and even on the marriage, entire expenses were borne by family of the petitioner. It is further contended that the deceased was interested in marrying to someone else, but she was forced to solemnize marriage with the petitioner by her family and on this account, she used to remain depressed. There is nothing on record to remotely suggest that the deceased was ever harassed on account of demand of dowry.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel appears on advance notice and submits that the deceased has died in the matrimonial home within one month of the marriage and there are specific allegations against the petitioner. The petitioner being husband of the deceased was harassing her for not bringing sufficient dowry according to their status and the investigation is at the initial stage.

5. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and after perusing the record of the case with their able assistance, this Court finds no ground to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case, without expressing any opinion on merits of the case, lest it may prejudice the outcome of the trial, present petition is dismissed.

[HARPREET SINGH BRAR]
JUDGE

01.08.2024
vishnu

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether Reportable : Yes/No