



204

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

**CRM-M-23701-2024**

Date of Decision:- 01.05.2025

**BHUPINDER SINGH AND ANOTHER**

...Petitioners

Vs.

**STATE OF PUNJAB**

...Respondent

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE AMARJOT BHATTI**

Present:- Mr. Parminder Singh Kanwar, Advocate for petitioners.

Mr. Japjot Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Vipin Mahajan, Advocate for the complainant.

**AMARJOT BHATTI, J.**

1. Petitioners have filed instant petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.13 dated 10.04.2024 under Sections 406 and 498-A of IPC registered at Police Station P.S. NRI, District Gurdaspur.

2. As per facts of the case, complainant Doctor Noopur Manhas filed written complaint against her husband and in-laws family alleging that she is legally wedded wife of Sangram Singh Pathania who is NRI serving as Engineer in Canada. After marriage, they lived together in matrimonial home at Dhar Kalan, Bhanguri, Pathankot. Her parents had performed marriage with great pomp and show by spending Rs.35 lakhs. She has given detail of dowry articles in FIR. Her in-laws' family started raising demand



for car and plot from her father. Her parents were unable to satisfy their demand. She was not permitted to pursue her career as BDS Doctor. Her father-in-law outraged her modesty and when this fact was brought to the notice of her husband, he tried to defend his father. She was mentally harassed by her husband. She tried to commit suicide twice. Her in-laws instigated her husband against her. She was even confined in the room. Her parents were taking care of her daily expenses. With these allegations, present FIR has been registered.

3. Learned counsel for petitioners argued that petitioners have joined investigation in pursuance of order dated 20.05.2024. They have handed over all the dowry articles which were in their possession. There was offer to settle the matter in Mediation and Conciliation Centre but it failed. Petitioners are still ready to cooperate with the Investigating Agency.

4. Detailed status report has been filed. Bail application is opposed by learned counsel representing State assisted by learned counsel for the complainant. It is conceded that some of the dowry articles are recovered. However, all dowry articles including gold ornaments are still in the possession of petitioners. There are serious allegations against petitioners. Son of petitioners is already in foreign country. Considering the specific allegations and the aforesaid factual position, they are not entitled to be released on anticipatory bail.

5. I have considered the arguments and have gone through the record. It is conceded that both petitioners joined investigation and the dowry articles were also recovered as per para No.7 of the status report dated 16.07.2024. However, counsel for complainant disputed that some of the



dowry articles and gold ornaments are yet to be recovered. The entrustment of gold items which are left to be recovered and its misappropriation is matter of trial. Present petitioners are in-laws of complainant. They have already joined the investigation. No purpose would be served by sending them behind the bars. Therefore, without going into the merits of the case, interim bail already granted vide order dated 20.05.2024 stands confirmed subject to the conditions envisaged under Section 438 (2) Cr.P.C.

6. Petition is, accordingly, allowed.

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

(AMARJOT BHATTI)  
JUDGE

01.05.2025

snd

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