



**101+203 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
CHANDIGARH**

**CRM-34990-2025
in/and CRM-M-18282-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 02.09.2025**

GURTEG SINGH

...Petitioner

V/S

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL

Present: Mr. Ravinder Singh Randhawa, Advocate and
Mr. Jayaditya Gupta, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Hardeep Singh Wadhwa, DAG Punjab.

Ms. Amrinder Kaur, Advocate
and Mr. Hitesh Verma, Advocate
for respondent No. 2-complainant.

SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL J. (Oral)

CRM-34990-2025

Allowed as prayed for and challan dated 22.05.2025 in FIR
No. 0022 dated 22.11.2024 under Sections 498-A, 406 of Indian Penal
Code, Police Station Women Cell, Bathinda, is taken on record, subject to
all just exceptions.

CRM-M-18282-2025

Petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case arising out of FIR No.
0022 dated 22.11.2024 under Sections 498-A and 406 of Indian Penal
Code, Police Station Women Cell, Bathinda. This is his first petition for
anticipatory bail.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner
was 77 years old father-in-law of sister of the complainant. He further



CRM-34990-2025
in/and CRM-M-18282-2025 (O&M)

-2-

submits that marriage of petitioner's son with sister of the complainant was solemnized on 14.02.2020. Soon thereafter, on 06.03.2020, petitioner's son went back to Australia. In October 2020, complainant's sister also followed him and both were now permanently settled in Australia. Learned counsel further refers to Annexure P-3, settlement deed, arrived at between petitioner's son and complainant's sister, vide which the husband had agreed to pay 1,00,000 dollars to the wife. It is stated that the amount has already been paid and all the disputes had been settled between the husband and wife, who were now divorced vide decree of dissolution of marriage (Annexure P-7).

Learned counsel further submits that daughter of the petitioner Prabhjot Kaur had since been enlarged on anticipatory bail vide order of this Court dated 13.02.2025 in CRM-M-62641-2024 (Annexure P-8) and challan had also been presented against her in the Court. The police was not joining the petitioner in investigation as there was no interim order in his favour for joining investigation. Learned counsel further urges that the FIR was lodged by the brother only as a mode of recovery of amount, he had spent in the marriage, despite the fact that all property matters between the couple had been settled vide Annexure P-4. He further submits that petitioner is ready and willing to join investigation, so he be enlarged on anticipatory bail.

Learned State counsel has filed reply by way of affidavit of Ishan Singla, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Crime against Women & Children, Bathinda. Same is taken on record.



CRM-34990-2025
in/and CRM-M-18282-2025 (O&M)

-3-

Learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for the complainant has no objection, if the petitioner is permitted to join investigation. They have however, disputed the arguments of learned counsel for the petitioner.

In the facts and circumstances of the case but without commenting on merits, lest it would prejudice the case of either party, the application for anticipatory bail is allowed and it is ordered that in the event of arrest, the petitioner shall be released on anticipatory bail subject to his furnishing personal and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting/Investigating Officer. Petitioner shall join investigation as and when called upon to do so and shall abide by the conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023.

The petition is allowed.

(SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL)
JUDGE

02.09.2025
Ajay Goswami

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No