



CRM-M-56873 of 2024 1

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

225 **CRM-M-56873 of 2024**
DATE OF DECISION :- 03.12.2024

Harpreet Kaur and another **...Petitioners**

Versus

State of Punjab and another **...Respondents**

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present:- Mr. Munish Behl, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Anup Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Parunjeet Singh, Advocate
for complainant-respondent No. 2.

SUMEET GOEL, J. (Oral)

1. This petition has been filed under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners in FIR No. 0218 dated 13.10.2024 registered for offences punishable under Sections 406, 498-A, 120-B of IPC at Police Station City Jagraon, District Ludhiana Rural.

2. On 14.11.2024, the following order was passed:-

“At the outset, learned counsel for the petitioners states that, due to inadvertence, the complainant could not be impleaded as a party-respondent. On his request, the complainant-respondent is directed to be impleaded as party-respondent No. 2. The details of the complainant-respondent No. 2 are as under :-
“Ivneet Kaur D/o Gurdeep Singh Dua, resident of H. No. 1717/32, Guru Teg Bahadur Mohalla, Ward No. 3, Jagraon.”



The Registry is directed to carry out requisite correction in the memo of parties.

Apprehending their arrest in FIR No. 0218 dated 13.10.2024 registered for offences punishable under Sections 406, 498-A, 120-B of IPC at Police Station City Jagraon, District Ludhiana Rural; the petitioners have preferred this petition under Section 482 of BNSS seeking pre-arrest bail.

Inter alia contends that genesis of the FIR in question is the matrimonial discord between the petitioners and the complainant-wife; the petitioners are willing to return the entire dowry articles/Istridhan including gold articles in their possession; petitioners are ready for an amicable settlement & the petitioners are willing to join investigation and cooperate therein. In order to buttress his arguments, learned counsel for the petitioner has relied upon the dicta of the judgments of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in 'Md. Asfak Alam versus The State of Jharkhand and another' 2023(3) R.C.R. (Criminal) 754 and 'Arnesh Kumar versus State of Bihar' (2014) 8 SCR 128.

On asking of the Court, Mr. Adhiraj Singh, AAG, Punjab appears and accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State.

Adjourned to 03.12.2024.

The petitioners are directed to appear before the Investigating Officer on 18.11.2024 at 11:00 A.M. in concerned Police Station and join investigation. In the event of arrest, the petitioners 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 petitioners shall join the investigation. They shall abide by the condition(s) enumerated under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023.

Process Dasti only qua respondent No. 2. It is made clear that in case service is not effected upon respondent No. 2 by way of Dasti process, the interim order granted today may be liable to be vacated on this score alone."



3. Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Kuldeep Singh, has stated that pursuant to the order dated 14.11.2024, the petitioners have joined investigation and are no longer required for custodial interrogation. However, learned State counsel as also the learned counsel for complainant-respondent No. 2 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 petitioners has submitted that no dowry articles/Istri-dhan are in possession of the petitioners and, in fact, the entire dowry articles/Istri-dhan 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 petitioners especially when the State does not require custodial interrogation of petitioners 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 petitioners 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 petitioners.

8. In view of above, the petition is allowed and interim order dated 14.11.2024 passed by this Court is made absolute, subject to the conditions as enumerated under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023.

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 petitioners violate any condition



CRM-M-56873 of 2024 **5**

stipulated under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 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.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

03.12.2024
P.Singh

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