



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

259

CRM-M-13868-2026 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 07.05.2026

OMUNG LUTHRA

....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NEERJA K. KALSON

Present: Mr. Mohinder Singh Kathuria, Advocate and
Mr. Keshav Bhandari, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Gorav Kathuria, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Vishavdeep Singh Rana, Advocate
for the complainant.

NEERJA K. KALSON, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023, seeking grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case arising out of FIR No. 0003 dated 14.01.2026, registered under Sections 316(2) and 85 of the BNS, 2023, at Women Police Station, District SAS Nagar, Punjab.

2. It has been alleged that the marriage between the petitioner and the complainant was solemnized on 08.11.2024, and thereafter, the complainant was subjected to harassment, physical and mental cruelty, as well as persistent demands for dowry. Allegations of physical assault and



torture on account of insufficient dowry have also been levelled against the petitioner.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the allegations levelled in the FIR are false, baseless and concocted. It is contended that the allegations pertaining to dowry demands and harassment are general and omnibus in nature without any specific instances being attributed to the petitioner. It is further submitted that the complainant suffered a natural miscarriage and the petitioner had ensured that she received proper medical attention. Learned counsel submits that there is no medical record or expert opinion to suggest that the miscarriage was induced or caused by any act or omission on the part of the petitioner. It is also contended that the co-accused, namely the mother-in-law of the complainant, has already been granted anticipatory bail by the learned Trial Court vide order dated 04.02.2026 and the allegations against the present petitioner are largely similar, if not less severe. It is further argued that the principle of parity would entitle the petitioner to the concession of anticipatory bail. Learned counsel further submits that vide order dated 02.04.2026, this Court had referred the matter to mediation and pursuant thereto, the parties have amicably resolved their disputes and entered into a compromise-cum-settlement agreement dated 27.04.2026.

4. Learned counsel for the complainant has also appeared before this Court and submits that the parties have entered into a settlement



agreement dated 27.04.2026 and that the complainant has no objection in case anticipatory bail is granted to the present petitioner in lieu of the abovementioned compromise.

5. *Per contra*, learned State counsel opposes the present petition and submits that the allegations levelled against the petitioner are serious in nature. It is contended that the petitioner, being the husband of the complainant, is the main accused in the present case and custodial interrogation may be required. However, learned State counsel does not dispute the factum of compromise entered into between the parties.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

7. Considering the nature of allegations, the fact that the parties have amicably resolved their disputes through a compromise-cum-settlement agreement dated 27.04.2026, the statement made on behalf of the complainant that in lieu of the compromise, she has no objection to the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, as well as the fact that the co-accused has already been granted anticipatory bail, this Court is of the considered view that the petitioner has made out a case for grant of anticipatory bail.

8. Accordingly, the present petition stands allowed. In the event of arrest, the petitioner shall be released on anticipatory bail subject to his furnishing requisite bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned Trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned.

2026:PHHC:071246



9.

The petitioner shall also abide by the conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of the BNSS, 2023, and in case of misuse of concession of bail, the prosecution shall be at liberty to seek cancellation of bail in accordance with law.
10.

Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed as an expression on the merits of the case.
- 11

Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

07.05.2026
Atul

(NEERJA K. KALSON)
JUDGE

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