



CRM-M-51219-2024

1

211 **IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CRM-M-51219-2024

Date of decision: 22.04.2025

MOHIT RAJAN

....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

....Respondent

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

Present: Mr. Arun Kumar Kanudal, Advocate for petitioner.
(appeared through video conferencing).

Mr. Kewal Singh, Addl.A.G. Punjab.

Ms. Harveen Kaur, Advocate for complainant.

AMARJOT BHATTI, J.

Petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.131, dated 12.09.2024, under Sections 406 and 498-A of IPC, registered at Police Station P.S. Women, SAS Nagar, Punjab.

2. As per facts of the case, complainant -Sukhwinder Kaur filed written complaint Annexure P-1 against her husband Mohit Rajan and others members of in-laws family on the basis of which present FIR Annexure P-2 has been registered. It is submitted that complainant-Sukhwinder Kaur got married with Mohit Rajan on 21.11.2021. Before marriage, the accused persons pressurized her parents to perform marriage as per their desire. Her father had withdrawn money from his GPF and her marriage was performed by spending money approximately Rs.20-25 lacs. The complainant has given detail of dowry articles given at the time of marriage along with huge amounts transferred in favour of accused No.1.



On different occasions, she was time and again asked to bring huge amounts. After marriage, she was continuously harassed and humiliated by all the accused persons. They also indulged in physical cruelty. She has narrated various incidents which took place in the matrimonial home from time to time. She was given merciless beatings. Ultimately, she filed the present complaint on the basis of which matter was inquired and the present FIR has been registered.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that all allegations levelled against him are false and baseless. All family members have been named by the complainant. Their marriage was simple and there was no demand of dowry. He tried to reconcile with the complainant but failed. No offence under Sections 406 and 498-A IPC is made out. Allegations are general in nature. By registration of this FIR, she has caused mental harassment to the petitioner. He is ready to abide by the terms of bail order. It is submitted that his anticipatory bail petition may be allowed.

4. Status report filed by learned State counsel is taken on record.

5. Bail petition is opposed by learned counsel representing State assisted by counsel for complainant. Learned counsel representing complainant has annexed list of dowry articles, photographs of marriage showing the gifts given at the time of marriage and bills regarding purchase of jewellery are also annexed. Statement of the Bank and the record regarding transfer of money in favour of petitioner from time to time is also annexed. It is pointed out that no dowry articles has been recovered. FIR was registered by thorough investigation. Therefore, petitioner is not entitled to be released on anticipatory bail.

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



record carefully. The complainant has placed on record various documents to show the money which was given from time to time as well as the bills regarding purchase of gold ornaments and the photographs of wedding showing gifts which were given to the members of in-laws family. Petitioner was granted interim relief vide order dated 05.02.2025 to explore the possibility of compromise. The matter was also referred to Mediation and Conciliation Centre but it remained unsettled. Despite given penalty of time till date not even single dowry article has been handed over.

In the light of aforesaid factual position, investigation is still incomplete. Dowry articles are yet to be recovered. Therefore, I do not find it proper for grant of anticipatory bail to petitioner and petition filed by him is accordingly dismissed.

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

(AMARJOT BHATTI)
JUDGE

22.04.2025
monika

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