



136

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

CRM-M-23609-2026 (O&M)

Date of decision: 26.05.2026

CHANDAN BHATEJA**...PETITIONER****VERSUS****STATE OF PUNJAB****...RESPONDENT****CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL**

Present: Mr. Manu Loona, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Kunwarbir Singh, AAG Punjab.

Mr. Rhythem Bajaj, Advocate
for the complainant.

SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL J.

1. Petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in FIR No. 73 dated 22.03.2026 under Sections 85, 316(2) Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, Police Station City-1 Abohar, District Fazilka. This is the first petition for anticipatory bail.
2. As per report of Mediation and Conciliation Centre, the matter was 'unsettled'.
3. While issuing notice of motion on 28.04.2026, following order was passed:-

“Petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in FIR No. 73 dated 22.03.2026 under Sections 85, 316(2) Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, Police Station City-1 Abohar, District Fazilka. This is the first petition for anticipatory bail.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the

marriage of the petitioner was solemnized with the complainant on 04.12.2022. The parties separated on 12.11.2024 and the FIR was registered after more than one year on 22.03.2026. He further submits that parents of the petitioner who were also arraigned as accused, had since been allowed anticipatory bail by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Fazilka vide order dated 23.04.2026. It is argued that both the husband and wife were IT engineers and had shifted to Pune after two months of the marriage. The allegations of demand of dowry, car, flat etc. were false and fabricated. The petitioner already owned a car and after marriage, he purchased a car in the name of the complainant by contributing money. The car was still with the complainant. For purchase of flat also, he paid up Rs.1,80,000/- but the amount was forfeited on account of disputes between the parties. Learned counsel then referred to Annexure P2, photographs to submit that all articles of istridhan were made over to the complainant prior to registration of the FIR. It was urged that normal wear and tear of married life was given colour of criminal offence. Petitioner, who had clean antecedents, was ready and willing to join investigation.

Notice of Motion.

Mr. Kunwarbir Singh, AAG Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of Respondent No.1-State. Mr. Rhythem Bajaj, Advocate appears on behalf of complainant and files his vakalatnama, which is taken on record. Learned State counsel, assisted by

learned counsel for the complainant submits that there were specific and serious allegations of demand of dowry and harassment against the petitioner and it was not a case of normal wear and tear. Prayer for anticipatory bail is opposed.

Both counsels are ad idem that the matter may be resolved through mediation. Accordingly, parties are directed to appear before the Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court on 30.04.2026 to work out the modalities of amicable settlement between them. For any other details parties may contact Dr. Amarpreet Kaur Sandhu, Co-ordinator, Mediation and Conciliation Centre, M. No. 9888881287, e-mail:supdt.mcc-phc@aij.gov.in.

In the facts and circumstances of the case, petitioner is directed to appear before the Investigating/Arresting Officer and join investigation within one week or as and when required. In the event of his arrest, the Investigating/Arresting Officer shall release the petitioner on interim anticipatory bail on furnishing personal/surety bonds to his/her satisfaction. The petitioner shall also abide by the conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023.

State is directed to file status report on 26.05.2026.”

4. Status report by way of affidavit of PPS, DSP, Sub Division Abohar, Fazilka has been filed by State of Punjab, which is taken on record. Learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for the complainant submits that though petitioner joined investigation on 03.05.2026, he did

not get recovered the gold articles. Prayer for anticipatory bail was opposed.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner refers to Annexure P2, photographs regarding entrustment of gold jewellery to the petitioner.

6. Pursuant to order of this Court dated 28.04.2026, petitioner has joined investigation. Benefit of anticipatory bail cannot be denied for the reason that some gold articles are yet to be recovered. Whether or not the gold articles were indeed entrusted to the petitioner would be a matter of trial. Considering all relevant facts and circumstances, the petition is allowed and order dated 28.04.2026, granting interim anticipatory bail to the petitioner, is made absolute, subject to the conditions laid down in Section 482(2) of Bharatiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023.

7. Pending miscellaneous applications, if any, stand disposed of.

26.05.2026

Sumit Singla

Whether speaking/reasoned

Whether reportable

(SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL)

JUDGE

:

:

Yes/No

Yes/No