



CRM-M-63909-2024

-1-

206

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

CRM-M-63909-2024

Date of Decision:- 11.09.2025

Kapil

....Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab and Anr.

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE AMARJOT BHATTI

Present:- Mr. Jasneet Mehra, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Manjot Kaur, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Amit Arora, Advocate for
respondent No.2.

AMARJOT BHATTI, J.

1. Petitioner Kapil has filed this petition under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeking anticipatory bail in FIR No.0154 dated 17.08.2024, under Section 498-A of IPC (Section 406 of IPC was added later on vide DDR No.35 dated 14.09.2024), registered at Police Station Gate Hakima, District Amritsar (Annexure P-1).

2. As per facts of the case, complainant Jaskiran Kaur stated that she got married with Kapil on 04-11-2022, according to *Sikh Rituals*. Her widow mother had spent huge money on her marriage as per her capacity. All dowry articles were entrusted to the family members of her husband. They were given gold ornaments, *shagun* and cloths as detailed in the FIR. Soon after marriage, her husband and his family members started taunting her repeatedly that the marriage was not performed in a proper manner. They were unhappy that her mother had not given her car or bullet

**CRM-M-63909-2024**

-2-

motorcycle in dowry. On the demand of her in-laws' family, her mother purchased a new AC worth Rs.50,000/- and gave it to her husband and in-laws' family. She was sent to Malta where her brother-in-law was residing with the assurance that he would look after her. When she reached there, her brother-in-law blocked her number. She informed her in-laws who in return told her to manage her own affairs as they had spent huge money on her. At the time of marriage, it was decided that her expenditure for sending her abroad and her education will be borne by her in-laws. Her in-laws demanded Rs.5 lakhs from her mother for bearing expenditure of her visa and flight ticket. Whenever she talked to her husband, he abused her and demanded more money. Finally, under depression, she came to India and lodged the report.

3. Learned counsel for petitioner argued that all allegations levelled against the petitioner are false and without any basis. The complainant did not file any complaint during the period she stayed in India. He had filed a complaint against his wife and mother-in-law dated 16-04-2024 (Annexure P-2). In fact, the respondent No.2 has committed fraud with the petitioner and she threatened to falsely implicate him in a dowry demand case. He never raised any demand from her in-laws' family. In fact, she is in relationship with another boy. The photographs uploaded on the net are Annexure P-3. His anticipatory bail application was wrongly declined by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Amritsar vide order dated 03-12-2024 (Annexure P-5). He was granted interim relief vide order dated 19.12.2024 and he has joined investigation. Therefore, interim bail already granted in his favour may be confirmed.

4. Learned counsel representing State filed status report



CRM-M-63909-2024

-3-

confirming the facts narrated in the FIR. It is admitted that petitioner has joined investigation on 28-12-2024 and during investigation, disclosure statement was also recorded. The gold ornaments belonging to the complainant were mortgaged with a finance company and Raju Jewellers, Amritsar. His custodial interrogation is required for fair investigation and for recovery of *istridhan* belonging to the complainant.

5. I have considered the arguments and have gone through the record. Petitioner was granted interim bail vide order dated 19-12-2024 passed by the Co-ordinate Bench. Till date, the interim order continued. There was no effort on the part of petitioner to recover the *istridhan* belonging to the complainant nor any gold ornament is recovered. List of dowry articles is Annexure R-1. During investigation, Gaurav Tejpal and his sister handed over a gold ring and gold tops to the investigating officer. Rest of the gold ornaments are yet to be recovered. Recovery of *istridhan* is part of the investigation. To complete the entire investigation, custodial interrogation of petitioner is required. Therefore, I do not find a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail and the same is accordingly declined. Interim already granted in favour of petitioner stands vacated.

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

11.09.2025

Sunil Devi

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