

**CRM-M-60327-2022 (O&M)**

-1-

101 + 267**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH****CRM-M-60327-2022 (O&M)**

Date of Decision:- 14.01.2025

Raman Deep Sandhu

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE AMARJOT BHATTIPresent:- Mr. S.K. Choudhary, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Gautam Thapar, AAG, Punjab.

Ms. Nanvika Gupta, Advocate and
Mr. Aakash Singla, Advocate
for respondent No. 2.

AMARJOT BHATTI, J.(Oral)**CRM-525-2025**

This is an application filed u/s 528 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for placing on record account statement of petitioner as Annexures P-6 and P-7.

For the reasons enumerated in application, same is allowed. Accompanying documents i.e. Annexure P-6 and Annexure P-7 are taken on record, subject to all just exceptions.

CRM-M-60327-2022 (O&M)

1. Petitioner Raman Deep Sandhu has filed anticipatory bail petition under Section 438 of Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in case



CRM-M-60327-2022 (O&M)

-2-

registered at Police Station Division No. 2, Pathankot.

2. Facts of the case are complainant Ruchi filed written complaint against her husband Raman Deep Sandhu and others alleging that she is well educated peace loving citizen. Her father retired as a Government employee. Her marriage was performed with Raman Deep Sandhu on 23.11.2019 as per Sikh customs at Delhi. Her parents had spent money as per their capacity. They had given gold, silver ornaments and other dowry articles. Raman Deep Sandhu was her colleague, serving in same company. She was under the influence of Raman Deep Sandhu. Few days before marriage, she came to know that Raman Deep Sandhu was already divorced. By that time, *roka* ceremony had taken place. She was threatened by Raman Deep Sandhu that he was having her objectionable photographs in his mobile phone and he will defame her in society. She was forced to marry him to save her dignity. After marriage, she was taunted and harassed in matrimonial home on account of their demand for household articles, gold ornaments as detailed in FIR. Her father-in-law Dalbir Singh Sandhu and husband Raman Deep Sandhu by putting pressure on her bought Maruti Ignis car bearing Registration No. DL-8CAS-9681, by making down payment of Rs. 1 lakh by withdrawing from her account. Installments are being paid from her salary and car is being used by her husband. Similarly, her brother-in-law pressurized to purchase Honda Activa Scooty with her money which is being used by her father-in-law. Her mother-in-law took her salary of Rs. 50,000/- on the pretext of making new beds. However, new beds were never taken and money was grabbed by her mother-in-law. Thereafter, her husband raised demand of Rs. 35



lakhs for going to Canada. She expressed her inability to satisfy this huge demand. She was beaten up by her husband and father-in-law under the influence of liquor. They threatened to kill her. Accused persons by putting pressure on her took her money to the tune of Rs. 11,46,298/-. Her husband and in-laws family turned out to be greedy persons. Ultimately, she was left at Delhi Railway Station by her husband and he went from there. Since then, she is residing in her parental house. Her husband filed a divorce case which is going on in Family Court, Dwarka, Delhi. With these allegations, matter was investigated and present FIR was registered.

3. Learned counsel for petitioner argued that petitioner is falsely implicated in this case. All allegations are false. Said car was purchased by petitioner which is a second hand car got financed by him and it is he who is paying installments. Said car is in the name of petitioner. Complainant has levelled false allegations against entire family. It is wrongly alleged that complainant was not aware of his divorce. In-fact, there is Whatsapp chat showing that she was fully aware of his first marriage. No recovery is to be effected from him. He has already joined investigation and still ready to do so. Therefore, his anticipatory bail petition may be allowed.

4. Bail petition is opposed by learned counsel representing State assisted by learned counsel for respondent No. 2/complainant. It is pointed out that detailed inquiry was conducted by Superintendent of Police, Punjab Bureau of Investigation, District Pathankot, according to which nothing came against Sukhwinder Kaur, Gagandeep Kaur and Dalbir Singh, whereas, allegations against present petitioner were found to be correct and it was further mentioned that he took Rs. 11,48,496/- and



CRM-M-60327-2022 (O&M)

-4-

further raised demand of Rs. 35 lakhs. It is further mentioned that as per directions of this Court, petitioner joined investigation on 13.09.2023 but he did not cooperate during investigation and no recovery could be effected as per list of dowry articles. Therefore, anticipatory bail petition filed by petitioner is strongly opposed by learned counsel(s) representing State as well as respondent No. 2.

5. I have considered the arguments and have gone through the record carefully. Present anticipatory bail petition was filed on 21.12.2022 and as per order dated 22.12.2022, it was ordered that no coercive action be taken against petitioner till next date. Thereafter, on the appearance of respondent No. 2/complainant, matter was referred to Mediation and Conciliation Centre vide order dated 06.01.2023 and *interim* in favour of present petitioner continued. In case in hand, mediation failed. Petitioner alleged that he was ready and willing to join investigation. However, there was no such direction in previous order dated 22.12.2022, whereas there was only direction that no coercive action be taken, accordingly, present petitioner was granted *interim* bail under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C. with further direction to join investigation. Thereafter, matter was again referred to Mediation and Conciliation Centre but no fruitful result could be achieved.

In the light of aforesaid factual position, it is clear that complainant levelled specific allegations of cruelty, maltreatment and extracting huge money from her by present petitioner. Despite availing number of opportunities, petitioner did not cooperate with Investigating Agency nor any recovery could be effected. Without recovery of dowry

articles, investigation is incomplete. Therefore, considering the peculiar facts and circumstances of case, I am not inclined to confirm *interim* bail granted in favour of petitioner and same is accordingly vacated and anticipatory bail petition filed by petitioner stands dismissed.

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

14.01.2025

(AMARJOT BHATTI)
JUDGE

lalit

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