



CRM-M-47980 of 2024 1

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

214 **CRM-M-47980 of 2024 (O&M)**
DATE OF DECISION :- 07.11.2024

Pritpal Singh **...Petitioner**

Versus

State of Haryana **...Respondent**

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present:- Mr. R.S. Randhawa, Advocate for the petitioner.
Ms. Priyanka Sadar, AAG, Haryana.
Mr. Abhimanyu Batra, Advocate for the complainant.

SUMEET GOEL, J. (Oral)

1. This petition has been filed under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.708 dated 4.9.2024, under Sections 406, 498-A and 506 of IPC, registered at Police Station Shahabad, District Kurukshetra.
2. On 16.10.2024, the following order was passed:-

“Apprehending his arrest in FIR No.708 dated 4.9.2024, under Sections 406, 498-A and 506 of IPC, registered at Police Station Shahabad, District Kurukshetra,; the petitioner has preferred this petition under Section 482 of



Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, seeking pre-arrest bail.

Status report by way of affidavit of Ram Kumar, HPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Shahabad (M), Kurukshetra, has been filed in Court today. The same be kept on record. Copy thereof has been furnished to learned counsel for the petitioner.

Inter alia contends that the genesis of the FIR is a matrimonial discord between the petitioner and the complainant, the petitioner is willing to return the dowry articles/gold articles in his possession in order to show his bona fide the petitioner is willing to hand over an amount of Rupees one lakh to the complainant & is willing for an amicable settlement & to join investigation and cooperate therein.

Adjourned to 7.11.2024.

The petitioner is directed to appear before the Investigating Officer on 21.10.2024 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 their 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. They shall abide by the condition(s) enumerated under Section 482(2) of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023.

The petitioner, as stated on his behalf, shall furnish the amount of Rupees one lakh to the complainant–wife by way of electronic transfer/or in cash before the concerned Judicial Magistrate within one week from today.”

3. Learned State counsel, on instructions from SI Naresh Kumar, has stated that pursuant to the order dated 16.10.2024, 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 complainant has vehemently opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner by arguing that the allegations made against the petitioner are serious in nature and hence anticipatory bail ought not to be granted to the petitioner. Learned counsel for the complainant has further

**CRM-M-47980 of 2024** **3**

iterated that the petitioner had even given beatings to the complainant and hence his anticipatory bail application ought to be rejected. Learned counsel for the complainant has further iterated that in case the petitioner is given anticipatory bail he may influence the investigation as also intimidate the complainant/witnesses.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that no dowry articles/Istri-dhan are in possession of the petitioner and, in fact, the entire dowry articles/Istri-dhan is with the aggrieved-wife.

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

7. 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.”

**CRM-M-47980 of 2024** **4**

8. 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.

9. In view of above, the petition is allowed and interim order dated 16.10.2024 passed by this Court is made absolute, subject to the conditions as enumerated under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023.

10. 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.

11. 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 Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 or upon showing any other sufficient cause.

12. Needless to say that anything observed herein above shall not be construed to be an opinion on the merits of the case.



CRM-M-47980 of 2024 **5**

13. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed off.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

07.11.2024
P.Singh

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