



206 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-61908-2024 (O&M)  
Date of Decision: 11.02.2025

MEEDA

...Petitioner

V/S

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR**

Present: Mr. Ritvik Garg, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sandeep Kumar, DAG Punjab

\*\*\*\*

**HARPREET SINGH BRAR J. (Oral)**

1. This is second petition preferred under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') seeking anticipatory bail in FIR No.129 dated 07.10.2024 under Sections 406 & 498-A of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (now Sections 316(2) & 85 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023), registered at Police Station Amloh, District Fatehgarh Sahib.

2. On 10.12.2024, following order was passed:

*"This is second petition preferred under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') seeking anticipatory bail in FIR No.129 dated 07.10.2024 under Sections 406 & 498-A of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (now Sections 316(2) & 85 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023), registered at Police Station Amloh, District Fatehgarh Sahib.*

*The first petition i.e. CRM-M-61203-2024 was dismissed as withdrawn on 05.12.2024, as some typographical mistake was crept in, in the head note and liberty was granted to file a fresh petition on the same cause of action with better particulars.*

*Learned counsel for the petitioner, inter alia, contends that the petitioner, who is mother-in-law of the*



*complainant, is 55 years of age and is a household lady and there is no specific allegation against her with regard to entrustment of dowry articles. All the allegations levelled against the petitioner are implausible and far-fetched. Moreover, the maximum sentence provided for the offences, under which the FIR (supra) is registered, is upto 03 years. Even no notice under Section 35 of BNSS [erstwhile Section 41-A of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (for short 'Cr.P.C.')] has been served upon the petitioner. As such, the petitioner is entitled to anticipatory bail in view of the directions issued by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Md. Asfak Alam Vs. State of Jharkhand and another, 2023 (3) RCR (Criminal) 754. It is further contended that there is no possibility of the petitioner fleeing from justice and pre-trial detention would cause irreparable loss, mental agony, embarrassment and humiliation to the petitioner as well his entire family.*

*Notice of motion.*

*At this stage, Mr. G.S. Salana, Advocate appears on behalf of the complainant and files his Vakalatnama in the Court today, which is taken on record. He vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner on the ground that there are specific allegations against the petitioner with regard to harassment on account of demand of dowry from the complainant.*

*Adjourned to 11.02.2025.*

*Keeping in view the ratio of law enunciated by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Arnesh Kumar Vs. State of Bihar, (2014) 8 SCC 273, Arnab Manoranjan Goswami Vs. State of Maharashtra, (2021) 2 SCC 427, Satender Kumar Antil Vs. CBI, (2022) 10 SCC 51, Siddharam Satlingappa Mhetre Vs. State of Maharashtra and ors., 2010 SCC OnLine SC 1375 and Shri Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia Vs. State of Punjab, (1980) 2 SCC 565, the petitioner is directed to appear before Investigating Officer within a period of two weeks from today and thereafter, as directed by the Investigating Officer. In the event of arrest, the petitioner shall be admitted to interim bail on furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of Investigating/Arresting Officer and the petitioner shall co-operate in the investigation. The petitioner shall cooperate with the investigation/Arresting*



*Officer and abide by the conditions as provided under Section 482(2) of BNSS (erstwhile Section 438(2) of Cr.P.C.).*

*If the Arresting Officer does not permit the petitioner to join the investigation, he would appear before learned Illaqa Magistrate, who would then summon the Arresting Officer and direct him to join the petitioner in the investigation, in terms of the order of this Court.*

*Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion by this Court and learned trial Court shall decide the same on its own merits, strictly in accordance with law.”*

3. Learned State counsel on instructions from ASI Kamaljeet Singh, submits that in compliance of order dated 10.12.2024 passed by this Court, the petitioner has not joined the investigation.

4. However, learned counsel for the petitioner disputes the aforesaid fact and submits that he has instructions that in compliance of the order dated 10.12.2024, petitioner has joined the investigation.

4. In view of the above, petitioner is again directed to appear before the learned Illaqa Magistrate on 18.02.2025 at 11.00 AM, who would then summon the Investigating Officer and direct him to join the petitioner in the investigation in terms of the order passed by this Court on 10.12.2024.

5. The petition is accordingly disposed of in aforesaid terms.

**(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)**  
**JUDGE**

11.02.2025  
Ajay Goswami

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