



CRM-M-52979-2025 (O&M)

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

205-2

CRM-M-52979-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision: 12.01.2026

MANDEEP SINGH ALIAS MANDEEP SINGH DHINJAL**PETITIONER****VERSUS****STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER****RESPONDENTS****CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL**

Present: Mr. Ramandeep, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Kunwarbir Singh, AAG Punjab.
Mr. Abhishek Chhoker, Advocate for respondent No.2.

Shalini Singh Nagpal, J. (Oral)

1. Petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case vide FIR No.139 dated 15.07.2025 under Sections 85, 318(4) and 61(2) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (B.N.S.), 2023, Police Station Civil Lines, Patiala, District Patiala. Sections 74, 351(3) and 316 BNS have been added in the FIR during investigation. This is the first petition for anticipatory bail.

2. On 19.09.2025, following order was passed:-

“Petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case vide FIR No.139, dated 15.07.2025, under Section 85, 318(4), 61(2) of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (B.N.S.S.), 2023, Police Station Civil Lines Patiala, District Patiala. This is his first application for aniticipatory bail. It is stated that Section 74, 351(3), 316 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (B.N.S.), 2023 have been added later on.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner was husband of respondent No.2. Marriage of petitioner and respondent No.2 was solemnized on 26.03.2023. Thereafter, respondent No.2 lived in the matrimonial home for less than one month and left on 21.04.2023. It is submitted that previously a complaint was made by



respondent No.2 to SSP Patiala which ended in a compromise before respectables which was reduced into writing. As per compromise affidavit (Annexure P-2), the parties had decided to seek divorce by mutual consent under Section 13-B of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that in pursuance of the compromise, petitioner had already paid a sum of ₹1,00,000/- to respondent No.2 and first motion statements were also recorded. Second motion statement, however, could not be recorded on account of petitioner's depressed state of mind. He further submits that petitioner was now ready and willing to honour the terms of the compromise and that there was a fair chance of settlement between the parties.

Learned counsel for the petitioner next submits that second complaint dated 10.07.2025 was made by respondent No.2 only to exert pressure for divorce. It is further submitted that vide affidavit Annexure P-2, respondent No.2 had sworn that she had received all the dowry articles from petitioner's family and there was nothing due. The petitioner was ready and willing to join investigation.

Notice of motion.

Mr. Kunwarbir Singh, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab, on advance notice, appears on behalf of the State and prays for time to file status report.

Let status report be filed by the Police on 11.11.2025.

Since there are fair chances of an amicable settlement, the parties i.e. petitioner and respondent No.2 shall appear before the Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court, on 08.10.2025, for making efforts for resolution of the dispute through mediation.

Meanwhile, petitioner is directed to surrender in Police Station, Patiala, within a week and join investigation. In the event of arrest, he shall be released on interim anticipatory bail, subject to his furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting/Investigating Officer. He shall abide by the conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023.

To be heard along with CRM-M-49615 of 2025."

3. Vide order dated 19.09.2025, the parties were referred to



CRM-M-52979-2025 (O&M)

the dispute. No request has been received from Mediation and Conciliation Centre for extension of time. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that pursuant to summons received, petitioner put in appearance before the Mediation and Conciliation Centre on 08.01.2026 but no one appeared from the respondent side and mediation could not take place. He further submits that petitioner had joined investigation in compliance with the order of this Court.

4. Learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for respondent No.2 opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail on the ground that though, petitioner joined investigation on 24.09.2025 and got effected recovery of some dowry articles, gold jewellery of the complainant was yet to be recovered.

5. Benefit of anticipatory bail cannot be declined merely on the ground that entire recovery has not been effected. Whether or not the gold articles were indeed entrusted to the petitioner would be a matter of evidence, to be led during the trial. Considering the entire facts and circumstances of the case, as enumerated above, but without commenting on merits, order dated 19.09.2025, granting interim anticipatory bail to the petitioner is made absolute, subject to conditions laid down in Section 482(2) Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023.

6. All the pending miscellaneous applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL)
JUDGE

12.01.2026
HS.CHAUHAN

Whether Speaking/Reasoned :
Whether Reportable :

Yes/No
Yes/No