



211

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

CRM-M-9432-2025

Date of Decision:- 06.05.2025

TARANDEEP SINGH

...Petitioner

Vs.

STATE OF PUNJAB & ORS.

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE AMARJOT BHATTI

Present:- Mr. Vaibhav Sehgal, Advocate for petitioner.

Mr. Japjot Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Ms. Arti Kaur, Advocate and Ms. Alisha Sharda, Advocate
for respondent No.3.

AMARJOT BHATTI, J.

1. Petitioner has filed instant petition under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.90 dated 18.12.2024 (Annexure P-1) under Sections 316 (2), 85 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 registered at Women Police Commissionerate, Ludhiana.

2. As per facts of the case, Doctor Guneet Kaur filed written complaint against her husband Tarandeep Singh and other members of in-laws family regarding harassment on account of demand of dowry. It is submitted that she is Dentist by profession. Her marriage was solemnized with Tarandeep Singh on 02.01.2017. Her parents had spent Rs.42.50 lakhs at the time of her marriage. She was given dowry articles as per their demand.



There was a condition that car should be given in marriage. Her parents took loan and purchased Honda City car. After marriage, in-laws family started taunting her that they should have given BMW vehicle. Her husband was also unhappy with the marriage. She was ill-treated on account of less dowry. It was alleged that dowry articles were of inferior quality. She was told to do entire work in the kitchen. Her husband harassed her by commenting on her appearance and also gave her filthy abuses. She was not permitted to talk to her college mates. She was told not to interact with her family members. She has narrated various incidents which took place in the matrimonial home. When she became pregnant nobody expressed any happiness on the said news. Even during pregnancy she was beaten up. She gave birth to a daughter on 29.01.2019. They expressed their displeasure on giving birth to a girl child. Their misbehaviour continued. Thereafter, marriage of his brother was fixed and the accused persons wanted to ruin his wedding. She repeatedly apologized for no reason requesting them to forgive if there was any mistake on their part. She continuously lived under threat. She was told to stay in her parental house. Finally, complaint was filed.

3. Learned counsel for petitioner argued that earlier relationship between them remained cordial. He even provided financial help to the parents of complainant. He has annexed copy of his bank statement (Annexure P-3). Dispute arose on account of temperamental differences. She has filed this complaint and also filed one case under DV Act. Petitioner has joined investigation time and again. Dowry articles are already recovered as per recovery memo dated 22.01.2025 (Annexure P-6). Complainant left the matrimonial home few days prior to the marriage of her brother in December,



2023 and also took away all her articles. He is still ready to join the investigation.

4. Learned counsel representing State assisted by counsel for respondent No.3 pointed out that it is a case of continuous maltreatment in the matrimonial home. At present, she is residing in her parental house along with her child. Recovery of dowry articles vide recovery memo dated 22.01.2025 is not disputed. It is pointed out that complainant was running a clinic in her matrimonial home which is lying closed and all her educational qualification documents are lying in the matrimonial home and the same were not returned. Therefore, petitioner is not entitled to be released on anticipatory bail.

5. I have considered the arguments and have gone through the record. Petitioner was granted interim relief vide order dated 18.02.2025. During the pendency of anticipatory bail application before the trial Court, dowry articles were recovered as per recovery memo dated 22.01.2025 (Annexure P-6). Matter was also referred to Mediation and Conciliation Centre but it remained unsettled. Learned counsel representing petitioner pointed out that educational certificates of respondent No.3 are not lying in matrimonial home. Otherwise same would have been returned. Record indicates that petitioner has already joined the investigation and substantial part of dowry articles are recovered. Allegations detailed in the FIR is matter of trial. No purpose would be served by sending petitioner behind the bars. Considering the aforesaid factual position, anticipatory bail filed by petitioner is allowed. He be not arrested. In case of his arrest, he be released on bail to the satisfaction of Arresting/Investigating Officer concerned,



subject to condition that petitioner will join investigation as and when required. He will not tamper with or interfere with investigation and will not leave country without prior permission as provided under Section 482 (2) of BNSS, 2023.

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

(AMARJOT BHATTI)
JUDGE

06.05.2025
snd

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