



CRM-M-42596-2023(O&amp;M)

-1-

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

**101+209**

**CRM-M-42596-2023(O&M)**  
Date of Decision:- 19.02.2025

**Rajbir Singh**

....Petitioner

Vs.

**State of Punjab**

...Respondent

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

Present:- Mr. G.S.Dhindsa, Advocate for petitioner.

Mr. Kewal Singh, Addl. A.G., Punjab.

Mr. Ashok Bhardwaj, Advocate for complainant.

\*\*\*\*\*

**AMARJOT BHATTI, J.**

1. Petitioner Rajbir Singh has filed petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.63 dated 27.07.2023, under Sections 406, 498-A of IPC, registered at Women Police Station, District Patiala (Annexure P-1).

2. As per facts of the case, complainant Charanjit Kaur filed written complaint alleging that she got married with Rajbir Singh on 27.03.2022 at Patiala. At the time of marriage, her parents had given gold ornaments and cash amount as per their status. They had spent Rs.15 Lacs on her marriage. After marriage, her husband and his family started complaining that dowry articles were given of poor quality. She continued to tolerate the harassment to save her marriage. She was continuously



CRM-M-42596-2023(O&amp;M)

-2-

taunted and harassed by her husband. Her husband was physically weak and was unable to perform sexual intercourse. He was a drunkard. On 30.09.2022, her husband and his family started raising demand for cash amount and a car. The complainant expressed her inability to satisfy this demand and on this, she was given beating. Ultimately, the complaint was filed.

3. Learned counsel for petitioner stated that petitioner was granted interim bail by Coordinate Bench vide order dated 28.08.2023. He has already joined the investigation several times. The facts of the case detailed in the FIR indicate that it was the complainant who did not want to stay in the matrimonial home. All allegations are false. He will abide by the terms of bail order.

4. Learned counsel representing State has already filed status report. Bail petition is opposed by learned counsel representing complainant. It is pointed out that there were specific serious allegations against present petitioner. The complainant was harassed time and again in the matrimonial home. Panchayats were also convened to rehabilitate the complainant but petitioner and his family refused to keep her. Since there are serious allegations of maltreatment on account of demand of dowry, petitioner is not entitled to be released on bail.

5. I have considered the arguments and have gone through the record. The facts of the case indicate that at present complainant Charanjit Kaur has expired on 15.02.2024. Petitioner was granted interim bail vide order dated 28.08.2023 and till date he is on interim bail. As per the version of learned counsel for complainant only few dowry articles were recovered,



CRM-M-42596-2023(O&amp;M)

-3-

whereas gold set, cash of Rs.5 Lacs and the money spent on marriage are yet to be recovered. So far as the recovery of gold set and aforesaid cash amount is concerned, the same is matter of trial. It is for the prosecution to establish that there is misappropriation of dowry articles. Petitioner is already on interim bail and he has joined the investigation time and again. No purpose would be served by sending him behind the bars. As per the status report, till date challan has not been presented in the aforesaid FIR. Petitioner is ready to face the trial and abide by the terms of bail order. Therefore, interim bail already granted in favour of petitioner vide order dated 28.08.2023 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.

19.02.2025

*Sunil Devi*

**(AMARJOT BHATTI)**  
**JUDGE**

|                           |          |
|---------------------------|----------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned | : Yes/No |
| Whether reportable        | : Yes/No |