

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

(166)

CRM-M-67491-2025 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 16.03.2026

SHIVANK ARORA

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE KIRTI SINGH

Present: Mr. Gagandeep Goel, Advocate and
Mr. Rajesh Kumar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Luvinder Sofat, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

KIRTI SINGH, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS'), is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, in case FIR No.135 dated 02.10.2025, under Sections 316(2) and 85 of BNS and Section 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act, registered at Police Station City-2 Abohar, District Fazilka.

2. Vide order dated 29.01.2026, the petitioner was directed to join investigation. The said order is reproduced hereinafter:-

“This Court, right from the beginning of the pendency of the present petition, made every possible effort to ensure that the parties understand the nuances of life; however, their egos and greed for money is far more strong.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the complainant is in possession of an amount of more than ₹1.5 crore belonging to the petitioner and has allegedly abused the trust reposed in her. It is contended that the said amount was shared with her, pursuant to which access to the relevant account details was provided, the complainant thereafter misappropriated the said amount.

Per contra, learned counsel for the complainant clarifies that no amount has been misused and, submits that the said amount was, in fact, given to the complainant as customary gifts by her parents at the time of marriage. It is further submitted that the complainant has also made a fixed deposit of more than ₹52 lakhs in favour of the children in order to secure their future.

Prima facie, it appears that the dispute between the parties emanates from matrimonial discord coupled with monetary disagreement. Both the parties are extremely money minded and have no scant respect for the interference given by this Court to amicably resolve the matter. Apparently, they belong to a generation which, at this stage, does not fully appreciate the value of relationships. The FIR, at this stage, appears to be an outcome of disharmony and monetary disputes between the parties.

The present case also reflects specific allegations that the complainant's father was compelled to incur expenses including an amount of ₹2 lakhs towards the purchase of branded clothes prior to the wedding and ₹6 lakhs towards the wedding related expenses, besides other demands. It is further specifically alleged that subsequently the petitioner and his parents subjected the complainant to cruelty and illegally demanded additional money from her parental family in the form of dowry, the details whereof have been specifically mentioned in the FIR.

This, prima facie, demonstrates that as per the own version of the complainant, dowry was, in fact, given. It is, in fact, on account of the apparent act of the father of the complainant who gave the dowry at the first instance that today the parties are litigating.

The society is slowly forgetting that giving dowry also attracts stringent provisions of law and at least the educated citizens of the society should understand the same.

In light of the above, the petitioner is directed to join investigation on 07.02.2026 at 10:00 A.M. before the Investigating Officer and cooperate with the Investigating Agency, even thereafter.

In the event of arrest, the petitioner be released on interim bail subject to furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting/Investigating Officer and the petitioner shall abide by the conditions as envisaged under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023.

However, it is made clear that this order shall not be construed as parity qua any other co-accused.

Adjourned to 16.03.2026."

3. Learned State counsel on instructions from the investigating officer concerned, submits that in compliance of order dated 29.01.2026, the petitioner has joined the investigation and is not required for any further investigation.

4. Having considered the aforesaid facts and circumstances, the petition is allowed. Order dated 29.01.2026 passed by this Court, is hereby made absolute, subject to the condition enumerated under Section 482(2) BNSS.

5. This order should not be treated as "blanket" order. It will not be read as granting the petitioner(s) indefinite protection from arrest. It shall be confined to the FIR mentioned *ibid* and will not operate in respect of any other incident that involves commission of an offence.

6. Liberty is reserved with the investigating agency/complainant to move to this Court for a direction under Section 483(3) of BNSS, 2023 (erstwhile Section 439(2) of Cr.P.C.), in the event of violation of any term, stipulated under Section 482(2) BNSS, or upon showing any other sufficient cause.

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

(KIRTI SINGH)
JUDGE

March 16, 2026
Ithlesh

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