



CRM-M-17775-2024

-1-

202

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

CRM-M-17775-2024

Date of Decision:-16.05.2025

Daljeet Singh

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab and Anr.

...Respondents

CORAM:-HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE AMARJOT BHATTI

Present:- Mr. S.S.Gill, Advocate for petitioner.

Mr. Japjot Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. C.S.Rana, Advocate for respondent No.2.

AMARJOT BHATTI, J.

1. The petitioner – Daljeet Singh has filed this petition under Section 438 of Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.19 dated 09.02.2024, under Sections 406, 498-A of IPC, 1860, registered at Police Station Amloh, District Fatehgarh Sahib.

2. As per facts of the case, complainant Jugdarshan Kaur filed written complaint against her husband Daljeet Singh and other members of in-laws family alleging that her marriage was performed with Daljeet Singh on 28.10.2020. Soon after marriage, she was harassed for demand of dowry. Her husband Daljeet Singh was having no source of income except income from the land. She was compelled to bring money from her parental house. She was beaten up and many times he tried to turn her out from the matrimonial home. Her mother-in-law suggested to bring money



from her mother and then behaviour of her husband will be fine with her. She was sent to parental house but she did not tell anything to her mother who started asking her as to when she will be taken back in the matrimonial home. Finally, she disclosed the whole story to her paternal uncle. The matter was discussed in the family and her in-laws were also called. After collecting Rs.3 Lacs, the same were handed over to her in-laws. She was sent back in the matrimonial home. Behaviour of her husband and in-laws remained good for some time. She became pregnant and after the delivery of child her in-laws came to see her in the hospital but thereafter, nobody visited her for about one month. She was constantly threatened by her mother-in-law raising demand for clothes, ornaments, cash etc. on the birth of first child. There was constant harassment in the matrimonial home on account of their demands from time to time. Her mother sold some land for sending her brother to foreign country. She was told to get her share from her mother from the said property. The complainant tried to explain that the said property belonged to her brother. On this, she was given merciless beating. The demands of her in-laws family increased day by day. Thereafter, she filed application to the police against her in-laws family. The matter was compromised but they again repeated their earlier behaviour. Her mobile phone was also snatched. She was told that nobody will talk to her from her parental house. Her husband again told her to get money from her mother. Finally, she was turned out of the matrimonial house by snatching her child. With these allegations, present FIR has been registered.

3. Learned counsel for petitioner argued that all allegations of



demand of dowry and maltreatment are false and without any basis. The matter was enquired by DSP, Amloh. The said report is Annexure P-1 and the allegations were found to be false. From the facts of the case, no offence under Section 406 of IPC is made out. There is no list of dowry articles. No recovery is to be effected from him. Learned counsel for petitioner levelled allegations against the complainant having extra marital affair with one Paramjit. Petitioner has already joined the investigation in compliance of order dated 05.09.2024. He is still ready to cooperate. It is prayed that his anticipatory bail application may be allowed.

4. Bail petition is opposed by learned counsel representing State. Detailed status report has been filed. After proper enquiry, FIR was registered. Dowry articles are yet to be recovered. Present petitioner illtreated his wife in order to compel her to bring money from her parental house. Therefore, petitioner is required to join the investigation.

Bail petition is also opposed by learned counsel representing respondent No.2/complainant taking the stand that complainant was continuously harassed during her entire stay in the matrimonial home. At the time of marriage, dowry articles in the shape of household articles, gold ornaments were given. The bills are annexed with the reply. The photograph of the complainant showing marks of injury on her face is Annexure R-2/2. Learned counsel for respondent No.2/complainant has annexed some of the photographs of marriage while giving gold ornaments and other customary gifts. All these articles are yet to be recovered. Therefore, petitioner is not entitled to be released on anticipatory bail.

5. I have considered the arguments and have gone through the



CRM-M-17775-2024

-4-

record carefully. As per facts of the case, the complainant is living in her parental house on account of maltreatment given to her in the matrimonial home in order to compel her to bring money. The facts narrated in the FIR are clear as to how she was illtreated in the matrimonial home from time to time. Learned counsel for complainant has also annexed the photographs of marriage giving gold ornaments and other gifts to the family members of petitioner. Petitioner who is the husband was granted interim bail vide order dated 05.09.2024, even then he did not cooperate with the investigating agency for the recovery of dowry articles which is the case property in the case in hand. In order to complete the investigation, recovery of dowry articles is also material.

In the light of aforesaid factual position, I do not find a fit case to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner and his anticipatory bail petition is accordingly declined.

6. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, stand disposed of accordingly as well.

16.05.2025

*Sunil Devi***(AMARJOT BHATTI)**
JUDGEWhether speaking/reasoned:
Whether reportable:Yes/No
Yes/No