



CRM-M-6824-2025

1

206

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

CRM-M-6824-2025

Date of decision: 24.04.2025

AMIT KUMAR

....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANR

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE **AMARJOT BHATTI**

Present: Mr. Harmanpreet Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Japjot Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Sandeep Sharma, Advocate for
Mr. Veneet Sharma, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

AMARJOT BHATTI, J.

Petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.73, dated 03.12.2024, under Sections 498-A, 406 and 323 IPC, registered at Police Station Women, District Police Commissionerate Amritsar.

2. As per facts of the case, complainant Minakshi filed written complaint against her husband Amit Kumar and in-laws family alleging that her marriage was performed with Amit Kumar on 22.02.2023. At the time of marriage, gold ornaments along with costly clothes and furniture etc. were given to her husband and other members of in-laws family. The dowry articles given was her *istridhan*. After marriage, she realized that the accused persons were unhappy with the dowry articles and started raising demand for cash of Rs.5 lakhs. She explained that her parents cannot



satisfy this demand. She was constantly ill-treated in the matrimonial home in order to compel her to satisfy their demand. When she insisted that her parents cannot give cash of Rs.5 lakhs to them, then they started raising demand for bullet motorcycle. She started residing with her parents at Amritsar and nobody came to see her. A Panchayat was convened on 26.01.2024 and the accused persons refused to take her back in the matrimonial home and insisted on their demand of cash of Rs.5 lakhs and bullet motorcycle.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that all allegations levelled against him and his family members are false. The marriage of petitioner and respondent No.2 was their second marriage, therefore, it was performed in a simple manner. It is denied that the complainant or his family had given gold ornaments. In fact, family of the petitioner had gifted gold ornaments at the time of marriage. The relevant photographs are Annexure P-2. No demand was raised regarding cash of Rs.5 lakhs or a bullet motorcycle. Petitioner is ready to join the investigation. Therefore his anticipatory bail petition may be allowed.

4. Bail petition is opposed by learned State counsel assisted by counsel for respondent No.2. Status report is filed confirming the facts detailed in the FIR. Anticipatory bail petition filed by the petitioner was rightly declined by passing impugned order dated 27.01.2025. Till date, no dowry articles have been recovered, therefore his custodial interrogation is required.

5. I have considered the facts of the case and gone through the record. As per order dated 27.01.2025 Annexure P-3, the matter was referred to Mediation Centre, District Legal Services Authority, Amritsar



but no compromise could be effected. Learned counsel for petitioner insisted that the marriage was simple. No dowry articles were given, therefore, no recovery is to be effected from the petitioner. The complainant has levelled serious allegations of maltreatment on account of demand of more dowry. She categorically stated that initially there was demand of cash of Rs.5 lakhs and then there was demand for a bullet motorcycle. The record indicates that till date *istridhan* of the complainant/respondent No.2 has not been recovered. Therefore, I do not find it proper for grant of anticipatory bail to petitioner and petition filed by him is accordingly dismissed.

6. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, stand disposed of accordingly as well.

(AMARJOT BHATTI)
JUDGE

24.04.2025
monika

1. Whether speaking/ reasoned	:	Yes /No
2. Whether reportable	:	Yes /No