



206

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

**CRM-30820-2025 in /and
CRM-M-62907-2024 (O&M)
Date of decision: 12.08.2025**

Vikas Vadhera

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. H.S. Sidhu, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Amit Rana, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

Ms. Rishma Verma, advocate
for the complainant.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J.

CRM-30820-2025

For the reasons stated in the application, the same is allowed.

Annexure P-9 to P-14 are taken on record.

CRM-M-62907-2024

1. The petitioner is seeking concession of anticipatory bail under Section 482 Bharatiya Nagarak Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS) in case FIR No. 126 dated 06.11.2024 under Sections 406, 498-A IPC, registered at Police Station Women, Police Commissionerate Jalandhar, District Jalandhar.



2. Vide order dated 20.12.2024 the petitioner had been granted interim bail with direction to join investigation and the relevant part of the said order reads as under :-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner, inter alia, submits that the petitioner was married to the complainant on 08.11.2019. One daughter was born out of the said wedlock on 01.8.2020, who is in the care and custody of the complainant/wife. Learned counsel has pointed out that this is the second marriage of the complainant. The petitioner and the complainant were in a love affair for a period of two years prior to the marriage. It is contended that the allegations made in the FIR that the petitioner was demanding money and a car from the complainant and her family; or that the parents of the complainant had given Rs.15,00,000/- to the petitioner at different times from the year 2023 to 2024; or that on 12.8.2024 the complainant’s brother received a phone call from one Bhavika, with whom the petitioner is supposed to be in illicit relation; or that the petitioner had given beatings to the complainant; and had threatened to abduct their daughter, are all false and fabricated. It is admitted that there is money dispute between the parties, however, all the allegations of making transfers of money into the account of petitioner are unsubstantiated, false and fabricated. It is submitted that the previously the application filed by the petitioner for grant of bail under Section 482 Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (B.N.S.S.) was dismissed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Jalandhar vide order dated 29.11.2024 (Annexure P-8) only on the ground that the recovery of istridhan has to be effected from the petitioner. It is submitted that the said ground is unsubstantiated as the complainant had come to the matrimonial home on 16.10.2024 with her maternal aunt (Mami) and had taken away all her jewellery and other



articles, as is evident from the photograph (Annexure P-5). Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the present FIR is counter blast to the complaint made by the petitioner on 24.9.2024 (Annexure P-2) against the complainant, which led to filing of the present complaint by the complainant on 26.9.2024, pursuant to which the present FIR (Annexure P-1) has been registered on 06.11.2024. Learned counsel for the petitioner prays for grant of interim relief to the petitioner and undertakes that the petitioner will join the investigation and co-operate with the Investigating Agency.”

3. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that in compliance of order dated 20.12.2024, the petitioner has joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the complainant submits that during the pendency of the instant petition, the petitioner has been extending threats of dire consequences to his wife i.e. the complainant, in which regard a report has also been made to the Commissioner of Police, Jalandhar on 02.05.2025.

5. Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Shishpal Singh, has submitted that they are not in receipt of any such complaint, as has been asserted by the counsel for the complainant and the complainant has never been called to the Women Police Station. However, learned State counsel, on instructions, does not dispute the factum of the petitioner having joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency. He on further instructions submits that the petitioner is not required for further investigation much less for his custodial interrogation.

6. In view of the above, the petition is allowed and interim order



dated 13.11.2024, is made absolute subject to the conditions laid down in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C. / 482(2) Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023.

12.08.2025

Satyawan

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No