



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

115

CRM-M-60461-2025 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 18.03.2026

JASJEET KAUR

...Petitioner

VERSUS

KANWALDEEP SINGH AND ANOTHER

...Respondents(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK JAIN

Present: Mr. Gursimran Singh Madaan, Advocate
for the applicant/petitioner.

Mr. Viren Sibal, A.P.P. for U.T., Chandigarh
for respondent no.2.

ALOK JAIN, J. (Oral)

Main Case

1. The present second petition has been filed seeking cancellation of bail granted to respondent no.1 vide orders dated 03.05.2025 in FIR No.17 dated 03.03.2025, under Sections 406, 498-A of IPC, registered at Women Police Station Sector 17, Chandigarh and setting aside the impugned order dated 18.09.2025 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Chandigarh whereby the application filed by the petitioner seeking cancellation of bail was dismissed.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that during the proceedings before the learned trial Court, the parties were relegated to Mediation Centre vide order dated 20.03.2025, wherein respondent no.1 had agreed to return the gold articles of the petitioner given in the marriage by her parents. However, it is submitted that despite the assurance, no efforts have been made by respondent no.1 to return the articles. Therefore, the bail



granted to the petitioner deserves to be cancelled, as the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required to recover the dowry/*istridhan* articles.

3. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner. From the perusal of record, there is nothing forthcoming which could demonstrate that the respondent no.1 has violated any conditions of bail. It is a settled principles of law that the cancellation of anticipatory bail stands on a different footing and can be justified only on the existence of cogent and overwhelming circumstances such as misuse of liberty, interference with the due course of investigation or violation of bail condition. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of *Dolat Ram vs. State of Haryana* 1995 SCC(1) 349, categorically held that bail once granted ought not to be cancelled in the mechanical manner or on mere apprehensions. In this backdrop, mere non-recovery of gold articles is not a ground to deny the concession of bail, when the investigating agency are vested with sufficient power under the law to conduct search of the premises.

4. Accordingly, in the absence of any violation of condition of bail, any material indicating non-cooperation, deliberate concealment or misuse of liberty granted to the accused, the concession granted cannot be withdrawn, accordingly, the present petition stands dismissed.

CRM-5609-2026

1. The instant application has been filed seeking correction in the order dated 20.01.2026, whereby inadvertently it has been recorded that respondent no.2 be again served by way of affixation on given address,



whereas respondent no.2 already stands represented by the learned counsel for State-U.T., Chandigarh and instead of respondent no.2, service was to be effected upon respondent no.1.

2. However, the perusal of paper-book demonstrates that in fact it is the petitioner who has wrongly nominated and mentioned that jewellery was entrusted to respondent no.2 despite the fact that respondent no.2 is U.T., Chandigarh in the memo of parties. The petitioner himself has created this confusion by his callous attitude and carelessness.

3. In light of above facts, the main case stands dismissed, no fresh orders are required to pass.

4. Pending application(s), if any, also stands disposed of.

(ALOK JAIN)
JUDGE

18.03.2026

Deepak Patwal

- | | | |
|----|---------------------------|--------|
| 1. | Whether speaking/reasoned | Yes/No |
| 2. | Whether reportable | Yes/No |