SooperKanoon - India's Premier Online Legal Search - sooperkanoon.com

Vikrant Sharma Vs. State of Punjab and Another

Vikrant Sharma Vs. State of Punjab and Another

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/1067217

Court : Punjab and Haryana

Decided On : Mar-18-2013

Appellant : Vikrant Sharma

Respondent : State of Punjab and Another

Judgement :

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH CRL.

MISC.

not M-23845 OF 201.DATE OF DECISION :

18. h MARCH, 2013 Vikrant Sharma .

Petitioner Versus State of Punjab & another .

Respondents CORAM : HONBLE Mr.JUSTICE L.N.MITTAL **** Present : Mr.Inderpal Singh Parmar, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr.Rupam Aggarwal, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab for respondent No.1.

Mr.Namit Gautam, Advocate for respondent No.2.

**** L.N.MITTAL, J.

(ORAL) Accused Vikrant Sharma has filed this petition under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure (in short Cr.P.C.) for anticipatory bail in case FIR No.50 dated 08.07.2012 registered under Sections 406 and 498-A IPC at Police Station Women Cell Ludhiana.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the case file.

Petitioner is husband of the complainant-respondent No.2.

Allegations are usual.

Counsel for the petitioner contended that pursuant to interim order of this Court, the petitioner has joined investigation and dowry articles have been recovered.

CRL.

MISC.

not M-23845 OF 201.-2- Learned state counsel on instructions from ASI Bhajan Singh stated that only one Nos.pin of gold and two payals of silver remained to be recovered from the petitioner.

Learned counsel for the complainant however stated that many gold ornaments are yet to be recovered from the petitioner.

I have carefully considered the matter.

No interim relief was initially granted to the petitioner while issuing notice of motion and even on the next date of hearing.

However when the parties sought adjournment to settle the dispute, interim relief was granted to the petitioner.

The case was ultimately sent to Mediation and Conciliation Centre for amicable settlement but the same could not be arrived at.

Keeping in view the allegations against the petitioner and the fact that he is said to be the only accused in the case now, I do not find it to be a fit case to extend

extraordinary concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

Dismissed, without expressing any opinion on merits of the case.

18th March, 2013 (L.N.MITTAL) raj JUDGE

SooperKanoon - India's Premier Online Legal Search - sooperkanoon.com