



CRM-M-10365-2025 1

205

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-10365-2025

Date of decision: 04.04.2025

DEEPAK SHARMA

....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE [AMARJOT BHATTI](#)

Present: Mr. Aanand Kumar Maurya, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Japjot Singh, AAG, Punjab.

[AMARJOT BHATTI, J.](#)

Petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.220, dated 03.10.2024, under Sections 82 and 316(2) of the BNS, 2023 (in short BNS, 2023), registered at Police Station Model Town, District Hoshiarpur (Annexure P-1).

2. As per facts of the case, the prosecutrix gave her statement that her marriage was performed with Deepak Shamra on 09.12.2020. Her parents had given gold ornaments, shagun, clothes etc. to her husband and his relatives. Husband of complainant i.e. Deepak Sharma was employed in AG Office, Shimla. Before marriage Deepak Sharma raised demand for money number of times from 19.10.2020 to 25.10.2020 on one pretext or the other. At the time of various functions and marriage, gold ornaments and watch etc. were given to the husband and gold earrings were given to his grandmother. All dowry articles were handed over to the members of



in-laws' family. After marriage, she came to know that her husband and mother-in-law were expecting TV, refrigerator and motorcycle in the dowry. She was physically and mentally tortured on account of their demands. She further came to know that her husband was in a habit of gambling and he had raised huge loan. With the passage of time, she realized that gold ornaments were missing from the house which were stolen and sold for his habit of gambling. Under these circumstances, she started working in a private firm and returned Rs.60,000/- to different persons taken by her husband. She has narrated various incidents when she was forced to transfer money by her husband. Finally, she came back home along with her child in 3 wearing clothes on 06.06.2024. Now, she is being threatened by her husband and mother-in-law.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that all allegations levelled against the petitioner are false. There were temperamental differences between the complainant and his family. The allegations regarding the demand of money or maltreatment are false. Petitioner is employed in AG Office, Shimla and he is a busy man. A false FIR has been lodged against him. He is not required for any other purpose. No offence is made out. It is prayed that his anticipatory bail application may be allowed.

4. Bail application is opposed by learned counsel representing State. Status report is filed. It is pointed out that on the complaint of complainant, inquiry report was conducted by DSP, Crime against Women and Children Hoshiarpur and after thorough inquiry present FIR has been registered. Mother-in-law namely Kanchan Sharma was granted interim by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Hoshiarpur and she has joined the



CRM-M-10365-2025 3

investigation. So far as, petitioner is concerned, he is avoiding his arrest. He is yet to join the investigation. For recovery of dowry articles. custodial interrogation is required.

5. I have considered the arguments and have gone through the record. Respondent No.2 complainant was served but she did not appear. As per the facts detailed in the FIR, there are allegations of maltreatment on account of demand of dowry. Facts of the case indicates that present petitioner sold some of the gold ornaments for his bad habit of gambling. He extracted money from the complainant and his family members from time to time. There was continuous maltreatment. It is further alleged that petitioner wasted entire money on online gambling. He also forced her to give money which she earned by working in a private firm. She was turned out of the matrimonial home on 25.12.2022. Thereafter, matter was compromised and she was again turned out on 06.06.2024. Considering the specific allegations and the fact that dowry articles and other valuable are yet to be recovered, his custodial interrogation is required. 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

04.04.2025
monika

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