



102+205

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-20612-2025 (O&M)

Date of Decision:- 11.07.2025

PRADEEP KUMAR

....Petitioner

Vs.

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE AMARJOT BHATTI

Present:- Mr. S.S. Nain, Advocate for petitioner.

Ms. Aditi Girdhar, AAG, Haryana.

Ms. Poorvi Sharma, Advocate for the complainant.

AMARJOT BHATTI, J.

CRM-25842-2025

Learned counsel for applicant/petitioner has filed an application for placing on record compromise dated 30.06.2025 as Annexure P-8 for the proper adjudication of the case.

Learned counsel for the State submits that he has no objection to the application being allowed.

For the reasons mentioned in the application and no objection suffered by State counsel, application is allowed and accompanied document is taken on record as Annexure P-8, subject to just exceptions.

Main case

Petitioner has filed instant petition under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail in



FIR No.13 dated 23.03.2025 under Sections 351 (3), 3 (5), 61 and 85 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 registered at Women Police Station, Ballabgarh and District Faridabad.

2. Facts of the case are, a written complaint was filed to SHO, Women Police Station, Ballabgarh, District Faridabad for taking legal action against Dr. Pradeep and others by complainant Varsha. As per facts, complainant Varsha got married with Pradeep on 06.12.2024. Since the couple wanted to go abroad for honeymoon who in order to apply passport, marriage ceremony took place in Arya Samaj Temple with their mutual consent so that they get their passport on time. Ring ceremony was also held on 05.03.2024. Accused Nos.1 and 2 told her parents that marriage was performed in a simple manner which has lowered their status in the society. They raised demand for gold rings, gold wrist watch and Fortuner car for accused No.1. Initially parents of applicant expressed their inability to fulfil their demand but accused Nos.1 and 2 threatened to break this relationship. Finally father of applicant borrowed money and booked a Vitara car in November, 2024. They also booked Devansh Vatika Sikri Ballabgarh Banquet Hall of the choice of accused Nos.1 and 2 along with food menu and other things. Parents of applicant had spent money beyond their capacity. Her parents assured to give other articles later-on. On 08.01.2025 a call was received from accused No.2 that accused No.1 was missing from several days and could not locate his whereabouts. One application was given to Police Station Chand Hat, Palwal. Father of applicant received information that accused No.1 ran away with accused No.3 because their family members were not fulfilling their demand. This fact was not disclosed to her



family that applicant No. 1 was in relationship. Her parents had already spent Rs. 28 lakhs in this marriage. Finally, this matrimonial alliance could not work out. Complaint was filed on the basis of which present FIR has been registered.

3. Learned counsel for petitioner argued that this FIR has been registered on account of matrimonial dispute. Anticipatory bail application filed by Pradeep Kumar was declined by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Faridabad vide order dated 16.04.2025 (Annexure P-1). Earlier Pradeep Kumar had filed criminal writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking protection of his life and liberty since he was being compelled for marriage, which was decided on 10.01.2025 (Annexure P-3). He also filed petition under Section 11 and 12 of Hindu Marriage Act for declaring his marriage with Varsha as null and void. Copy of petition is Annexure P-5. It is pointed out that now the matter has been compromised vide compromise deed dated 30.06.2025 (Annexure P-8). Petitioners have filed petition seeking quashing of FIR in which status report has been called for. Downloaded copy of order dated 07.07.2025 passed by this Court in CRM-M-34706-2025 is also annexed herewith. Petitioner is ready to join investigation as and when required. It is submitted that his anticipatory bail application may be allowed.

4. Detailed status report has been filed confirming the facts stated in the FIR. Learned counsel representing State pointed out that investigation in this case is at initial stage. Dowry articles are yet to be recovered and petitioner is to join the investigation.



However, learned counsel representing complainant confirmed that matter has been compromised vide deed of compromise (Annexure P-8) and petition has been filed for quashing of aforesaid FIR.

5. Considering the aforesaid factual position, no purpose would be served by sending the petitioner behind the bars. Matrimonial dispute has been settled. Compromise is not disputed by complainant. Therefore, in light of aforesaid factual position, anticipatory bail application filed by petitioner is allowed subject to the conditions enshrined under Section 482 (2) of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023.

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

(AMARJOT BHATTI)
JUDGE

11.07.2025
snd

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