

**IN THE COURT OF VARUN NAGPAL,
ADDL. SESSIONS JUDGE, PATIALA UID (PB00204)**

CIS No.	BA-2422-2026
CNR No.	PBPT010073052026
Date of Instt.	19.6.2026
Date of Order	17.8.2026

Gurmeet Singh, aged about 31 years son of Paramjit Singh, resident of Amamgarh Mohalla, Samana, P.S.City Samana, Tehsil Samana, District Patiala.

....Applicant/accused

Versus

State of Punjab

FIR No. 21 dt. 20.3.2026
Under Section 316(2)/85 of BNS
P.S. Women Cell, Patiala.

Application for Bail U/s 482 of BNSS

Present: Sh.K.K.Murari, Advocate, Ld. Counsel for applicant.
Sh.Charanjeet Singh Bhullar, Addl.P.P for the State assisted
by Sh.R.S.Sandhu, Advocate, Ld. Counsel for complainant.

ORDER

1. Applicant/accused has filed this bail application under Section 482 BNSS in a case FIR No. 21 dt. 20.3.2026, Under Section 316(2)/85 of BNS, P.S. Women Cell, Patiala. Before proceeding further, it is pertinent to mention here that during the pendency of the bail application, the matter was referred to Mediation Centre, Patiala to explore the possibility of compromise between the parties. Both the

Varun Nagpal
ASJ/Patiala
Dated 17.8.2026

counsel for the accused and complainant has stated that the Mediation remained unsuccessful between the parties.

2. Upon notice, learned Additional Public Prosecutor appeared on behalf of State and Sh.R.S.Sandhu, Advocate appeared on behalf of the complainant to assist Ld. APP for the State.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant has argued that applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated at the instance of complainant and has not committed any offence. It is further argued that nothing is to be recovered from the applicant and investigation of the case has also been completed. It is further argued that the applicant is ready to join investigation and his custodial interrogation is not required. Accordingly, he has prayed for concession of anticipatory bail to the applicant.

4. On the other hand, while controverting his contentions, the learned Addl. P.P for the State has vehemently argued that the allegations against the applicant/accused are grave in nature. There are specific allegations regarding his involvement in the commission of offence and his custodial interrogation is required for proper investigation of the case. So, he does not deserve the leniency of the Court in grant of relief of anticipatory bail.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for applicant/accused and learned Addl.PP for the State and have also gone through the record.

6. Police record received. Perusal of police record reflects that the present FIR has been registered on the basis of complaint moved by complainant Rekha Devi to the effect that her marriage was solemnized with Gurmeet Singh on 27.2.2021 and her parents had given dowry articles and had spent Rs.35 lacs on the marriage. After some days of marriage, her husband and in laws family members started taunting and harassing her for bringing insufficient dowry and demanded a Scorpio/Thar car. The in laws family members used to instigate Gurmeet Singh upon which he used to beat the complainant. In January, 2023 accused persons pushed the complainant out of the matrimonial house and kept all the entrusted articles with them. Thereafter accused Gurmeet Singh filed a petition before Family Court, Samana and undertook to take complainant with him but he went to his Army duty and did not take complainant with him. Thereafter, he came from duty and took complainant with him to his house but accused persons again started harassing her and Gurmeet Singh had given Kara and Sword blows to complainant and she was admitted to hospital by her brothers. Consequently the FIR in question has been registered.

7. At the very out, perusal of the record shows that the FIR in question has been registered against the accused Gurmeet Singh by name on the statement of the complainant Rekha Devi. There are specific allegations of criminal breach of trust, and cruelty on account of demand of dowry against the accused. The allegations against the

applicant/accused are quite serious in nature. On the other hand, Ld. Counsel for the accused has vehemently argued that there are general allegations raised against accused in the FIR regarding the cruelty and criminal breach of trust. The allegations and counter allegations raised by both the accused and complainant side is a matter of evidence, prima facie the allegations against the accused are quite serious in nature. The contention raised by Ld. Counsel for the accused that the false FIR has been registered against the accused does not seem to be convincing at all because the scrutiny of the record shows that present FIR was registered against the accused after due enquiry. In the light of nature of allegations raised against the accused, in order to take the investigation to the logical end, the custodial interrogation of the accused is very much necessary. Taking into consideration the serious allegations of torture on account of demand of dowry and criminal breach of trust, in order to probe the entire incident and in order to unearth the entire matter, the custodial interrogation of the applicant/accused is very much necessary. The recovery of dowry articles is also to be effected. In the light of allegations so raised, this court is of the considered opinion that custodial interrogation of accused/applicant is very much required for an effective investigation to elicit the various details pertaining to the offence, which are in the exclusive knowledge of the accused/applicant being the husband of the complainant. The contention raised by the Ld Counsel for applicant/accused that applicant/accused has been falsely implicated in

this case, is a matter of evidence and the same shall be appreciated during the course of trial. At this stage, giving an opinion regarding the false implication will amount to jumping on an early conclusion without any appreciation of evidence. So in these circumstances, taking into consideration the grave allegations against the applicant/accused, no exceptional circumstances are made out to release the applicant/accused on pre-arrest bail. The concession of bail under Section 438 of Code of Criminal Procedure is of extra ordinary character and the same is to be exercised sparingly and in exceptional circumstances but the applicant/accused has not been in a position to make out a case for the grant of the same in his favour. So, in the light of above said facts and circumstances and taking into consideration the nature and gravity of the offence, applicant/accused **Gurmeet Singh** has failed to make out a case for releasing him on anticipatory bail. Hence, the bail application in hand is **dismissed**.

It is made clear that any of the observations made herein above while disposing of this bail application shall not be construed as opinion of the undersigned on the merits of the case.

Police record be returned immediately along with copy of this order. Record of this bail application be consigned to Sessions Court record room, Patiala.

Date of order: 17.8.2026

Maddur Khosla

(Directly dictated on computer)

(Varun Nagpal)
Addl. Sessions Judge/Patiala
UID(PB00204)

Varun Nagpal
ASJ/Patiala
Dated 17.8.2026

CIS No.	BA-2422-2026
CNR No.	PBPT010073052026

Present: Sh.K.K.Murari, Advocate, Ld. Counsel for applicant.
Sh.Charanjeet Singh Bhullar, Addl.P.P for the State assisted
by Sh.R.S.Sandhu, Advocate, Ld. Counsel for complainant.

Arguments heard and concluded. Vide my separate detailed
order of even date, the bail application filed by applicant/accused
Gurmeet Singh has been dismissed. Record , if any be returned and bail
application papers be consigned to the Record Room.

Date of order: 17.8.2026

Maddur Khosla

(Varun Nagpal)
Addl. Sessions Judge/Patiala
UID(PB00204)

Varun Nagpal
ASJ/Patiala
Dated 17.8.2026