



CRM-M-37578-2024

1

212 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-37578-2024
Date of decision: 25.02.2025

Sahil ChhabraPetitioner
Versus
State of Punjab and anotherRespondents

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

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

Mr. Gautam Thapar, AAG, Punjab.

AMARJOT BHATTI, J.

Petitioner-Sahil Chhabra has filed the present petition under Section 438 of Cr.P.C., for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.43, dated 06.06.2024 under Sections 406, 498-A, 354 and 34 IPC, registered at Police Station Women Cell, District Commissionerate Jalandhar (Annexure P-1).

2. As per facts of the case, complainant-Twinkle filed written complaint against her husband Sahil Chhabra and other members of the in-laws family that she got married with Sahil Chhabra on 05.12.2019. Her parents had given dowry articles and other costly gifts to the family members of her husband as well as to the complainant and had spent about Rs.7,50,000/- at the time of marriage. Her parents had spent huge money at the time of performing other functions. Immediately after marriage her in-laws family turned out to be greedy persons. She was harassed for bringing less dowry. They started raising demand for cash of Rs.5 lacs and other electronic goods. During this period, she became pregnant. Child was born on 16.11.2020. There was no change in their attitude. Their demands raised with the passage of time. The complainant has narrated various incidents which took place in the matrimonial home. Now at present she residing in her parental home along with her child.



3. Learned counsel for petitioner argued that petitioner has already joined the investigation in pursuance of order dated 13.08.2024. He is still ready to join the investigation. Dowry articles were recovered earlier, copy of recovery memo is Annexure P-4. He is still ready to abide by the terms of bail order.

4. Bail application is opposed by learned counsel representing State. It is confirmed that petitioner has joined the investigation on 09.09.2024 but gold ornaments are yet to be recovered. Therefore, petitioner is not entitled to the relief of anticipatory bail.

5. I have considered the arguments and have gone through the record. Present FIR/complaint has been filed by the complainant on account of matrimonial dispute. As referred above, Subhash Chhabra himself produced the dowry articles in the Police Station details of which is given in the memo of production of dowry articles Annexure P-4. At present petitioner has also joined the investigation and he is still ready to abide by the terms of bail order. In case, any gold ornaments are left in the possession of petitioner or other co-accused i.e. matter of trial. No purpose would be served by sending the petitioner behind the bars. Therefore, interim bail already granted vide order dated 13.08.2024 stands confirmed subject to the conditions detailed under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

6. Petition is, accordingly, disposed of.

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

(AMARJOT BHATTI)
JUDGE

25.02.2025
monika

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