



CRM-M-62563-2024

-1-

210

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

CRM-M-62563-2024

Date of Decision:- 21.04.2025

RAVINDER SINGH @ RINKU

....Petitioner

Vs.

STATE OF PUNJAB & ANR.

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE AMARJOT BHATTI

Present:- Mr. Sukhwinder Singh Dhillon, Advocate for petitioner.

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

Mr. Divyadeep Walia, Advocate for respondent No.2.

AMARJOT BHATTI, J.

1. Petitioner has filed instant petition under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.7 dated 30.06.2024 under Sections 498-A, 406 of IPC registered at Police Station Women Cell Bathinda, District Bathinda.

2. As per the facts of case, Amanjeet Kaur complainant filed written complaint against her husband Ravinder Singh @ Rinku and other members of in-laws' family for maltreatment on account of demand of dowry, beating and ill treatment given to her daughter Harseerat Kaur. Complainant alleged that she got married with Ravinder Singh on 22.11.2019. At the time of marriage, her parents had given gold ornaments to her husband and other members of in-laws' family. She was given household articles, electrical appliances as per their demand. Her parents had spent huge money on the reception of *baraat*. She was given gold



ornaments and other articles as detailed in the FIR. Soon after marriage, ill-treatment started on account of their demand for a car and more dowry articles. She gave birth to a daughter on 04.12.2020. All expenses were borne by her parents. She was again given customary gifts. In June, 2021 she went to attend her duty in D.C. Office Sri Muktsar Sahib and left her daughter Harseerat Kaur with her in-laws. Her in-laws family were unhappy with the birth of a baby girl. She was sent a photograph on whatsapp of her mobile phone No.78886-74651 showing her elder brother-in-law ill-treating her minor daughter by placing her on the ground and he had put his feet on her chest and her daughter was crying. She immediately left the office and reached home. Her brother had also reached there per chance to meet them. Finally, she was turned out of the house. Offer was made to reconcile with the intervention of respectables but it did not materialise.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that all allegations levelled against petitioner are false. Their marriage was performed in a simple manner and no dowry articles were given. Petitioner is an Advocate by profession practicing at Sri Muktsar Sahib. In-fact, complainant used to taunt him and was disrespectful towards family. She left the matrimonial home on her own in the year 2022. Thereafter, he filed a divorce petition. It was petitioner, who had given clothes, gold ornaments and other articles to the complainant. He has already joined the investigation. It is submitted that his anticipatory bail application may be allowed.

4. Bail application is opposed by learned counsel representing State of Punjab assisted by learned counsel for the complainant. Detailed status report is also filed according to which during investigation only four



gold rings were handed over which are taken into police possession. Other dowry articles are yet to be recovered. He has not cooperated with the Investigating Agency. Therefore, his custodial interrogation is required.

5. I have considered the arguments and have gone through the record. Aforesaid factual position indicates that petitioner was granted interim bail vide order dated 12.12.2024 and he did not cooperate with the Investigating Agency for the recovery of dowry articles belonging to the complainant which is her *istridhan*. There are serious allegations of maltreatment on account of demand of dowry as well as ill-treatment given to the minor girl child in the matrimonial home of the complainant. Matter was also referred to Mediation and Conciliation Centre but it could not bear any fruitful result. Since the dowry articles which is a case property is yet to be recovered, therefore, I do not find appropriate to grant discretionary relief of anticipatory bail to the petitioner and accordingly, his anticipatory bail application is declined.

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

(AMARJOT BHATTI)
JUDGE

21.04.2025

snd

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