



CRM-M-48843-2025

1

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

(103)

CRM-M-48843-2025

Date of Decision:- 15.10.2025

Prabhjot Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK JAIN

Present: Mr. Sandeep Arora, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Amandeep Singh Samra, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. J.S. Ghuman, Advocate for the complainant.

ALOK JAIN, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed seeking grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No. 113 dated 14.07.2025 under Sections 316(2) and 85 of the BNS, 2023 registered at Police Station Adampur, District Jalandhar Rural.

2. On the very first date of hearing, learned counsel for the parties have submitted that the matter be referred to the Mediation and Conciliation Centre, to explore a possibility of an amicable settlement. Only for the said purpose, the arrest of the petitioner was stayed.

3. Subsequently, the Mediation failed and the matter has been heard on merits.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that all the allegations leveled in the FIR are false and fabricated and there has never



been any demand of dowry by the petitioner, though, he maintains that there are certain matrimonial discords between the husband and wife but every matrimonial discord would not attract the rigors of Sections 316(2) and 85 of the BNS, 2023. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that there is only one transaction of Rs. 97,000/- which was deposited in the account of the petitioner's cousin and there is no *iota* of truth in the allegation regarding payment of Rs. 6,00,000/- in cash much less there is no disclosure in the FIR with regard to the source of above-said amount. Moreover, there is no list of dowry articles mentioned in the FIR. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the allegations of adultery are also unfounded.

3. *Per contra*, learned State counsel, assisted by learned counsel for the complainant, submits that all the gold articles are still in the possession of the petitioner and his mother and are yet to be recovered. It is further submitted that the complainant was thrown out of the matrimonial home and, even after the grant of interim protection to the petitioner, she was brutally assaulted, for which they rely upon Annexure R-1 appended with the application along with the photographs in support thereof. It is further contended that the video duly recorded in the pen drive will be submitted before the trial Court and shall be proved to the hilt, however, *prima facie*, in the said video recording, the petitioner can be heard stating that since he has been granted the protection by the High Court, he can do anything.

4. In light of the above, and considering the serious allegations of demand of dowry coupled with the misappropriation of dowry articles



already given, as well as the *prima facie* evidence that the amount has been transferred from the account of parents of the complainant, and the fact that the petitioner has misused the interim protection granted to him and assaulted the complainant, this Court does not find it a fit case to grant the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the present petition stands dismissed.

5. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

(ALOK JAIN)
JUDGE

15.10.2025
Parul

Whether speaking/reasoned:-	Yes/No
Whether Reportable:-	Yes/No