

Mohammad Danish Ansari Vs. State of Punjab1

**IN THE COURT OF PARMINDER SINGH GREWAL,
ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE, MALERKOTLA. UID
No.PB0438**

CIS Regst.No.....BA/104/2026
CNR No.PBSGF4-0002352026
Date of Order.....12.02.2026

Mohammad Danish Ansari aged 32 years son of Nishar Ahmad, resident of House No.134, Batala Road, Near Puri Clinic, New Mahindra Colony, Amritsar

....Applicant/Accused

Versus

State of Punjab

....Respondent

FIR No.26 dated 24.11.2025
under Sections 85 and 316(2) of BNS, 2023
Police Station: Women Cell, Malerkotla

**Application under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 for
grant of anticipatory bail**

Present : Mr. Manav Anand, Advocate for the petitioner
Mr. Harkamal Singh, Addl. P.P. for the State
Mr. RR Jain, Advocate for the complainant.

ORDER:

1. This order of this court shall dispose of the present bail petition file in case FIR No.26 dated 24.11.2025, under Sections 85 and 316(2) of BNS, 2023, registered at Police Station Women Cell, Malerkotla for releasing the present petitioner on anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is innocent and the complainant got registered the present false

Parminder Singh Grewal
Additonal Sessions Judge
Malerkotla. 12.02.2026

FIR against the petitioner. He has further submitted that the petitioner had filed a civil suit for declaration for dissolution of marriage before the Family Court, Amritsar. He has further submitted that the present FIR is the counter blast of the said case. He has further submitted that the police had issued the notice under Section 35(3) of BNSS, 2023 and the petitioner went to the police Station for joining the investigation. He has further submitted that the petitioner has the apprehension of his arrest at hands of the police. He has further submitted that the petitioner is ready to join the investigation as and when directed by the court. Learned counsel for the petitioner has relied upon the case law titled as, **“Harvinder Singh Vs. State of Punjab” Law Finder Doc Id # 2574598; Daljit Singh Vs. State of Punjab and another” Law Finder Doc Id # 2102728; Naresh Kumar Vs. UT of Chandigarh and others” Law Finder Doc Id # 1812468; Gurvinder Singh Vs. State of Punjab and others” Law Finder Doc Id # 2161073 and Appasaheb and another Vs. State of Maharashtra 2007(1) RCR (Criminal) 747”**. He has thus, prayed that present bail application may kindly be allowed.

3. On the other hand, Ld. Additional Public Prosecutor for State has submitted that the petitioner alongwith his co-accused had demanded dowry from the complainant and also harassed her and as such, the present petitioner is not entitled to be released on anticipatory bail. He has thus, prayed that the present bail petition may kindly be dismissed.

4. This court has heard ld. counsel for the petitioner as well as

ld. Additional Public Prosecutor for State assisted by the learned counsel for the complainant and have perused the record of the present case with their able assistance.

5. This court is of the considered view that as per the allegations leveled against the present petitioner in the present FIR case, the present FIR has been registered on the basis of the complaint of the complainant Sadia, in which, it has been alleged that her marriage was performed by her parents with Mohd. Danish on dated 10.07.2024 and all the dowry articles i.e. furniture, Electric goods, gold and clothes etc have been entrusted in the marriage to the petitioner and his family members. It has been further alleged that her mother-in-law and sister-in-law had created differences between her and her husband. It has been further alleged that she was always humiliated by her in-laws family and mentally tortured by them, due to which, she had gone under depression. It has been further alleged that her jewellery was kept by the petitioner and his family members. It has been further alleged that her in-laws family had made demands of more gold ornaments. It has been further alleged that when she was ill at any time, she was asked to do work forcibly. It has been further alleged that due to harassment of her in-laws family, she has been physically and mentally disturbed. It has been further alleged that she was not allowed to do the job by going outside the house. It has been further alleged that when she was pregnant, she was mentally tortured by her in-laws family. It has been further alleged that the petitioner and his family

members always told her that she is not beautiful.

Furthermore, this Court is of the considered view that the custodial interrogation of the present petitioner is required to ascertain the alleged mode and manner of alleged commission of alleged offence committed by the petitioner and his co-accused and for recovery of the alleged dowry articles from the petitioner and his co-accused and thus, the petitioner is not entitled to be released on anticipatory bail at this stage.

The case law relied upon titled as, **“Harvinder Singh Vs. State of Punjab” Law Finder Doc Id # 2574598; Daljit Singh Vs. State of Punjab and another” Law Finder Doc Id # 2102728; Naresh Kumar Vs. UT of Chandigarh and others” Law Finder Doc Id # 1812468; Gurvinder Singh Vs. State of Punjab and others” Law Finder Doc Id # 2161073 and Appasaheb and another Vs. State of Maharashtra 2007(1) RCR (Criminal) 747”** relied upon by the learned counsel for the petitioner is not of any help to the petitioner as the same is distinguishable on facts and therefore, its ratio do not apply to the peculiar facts of the present case. Furthermore, the arguments raised by the learned counsel for the petitioner pertain to the disputed questions of fact, which can only be ascertained after completion of the investigation and conclusion of trial after leading of the evidence and therefore, these arguments are not of any help to the petitioner at this preliminary stage of investigation.

6. In view of the reasons discussed herein before and after

keeping in view the gravity and seriousness of the alleged offence, the present anticipatory bail petition filed by the present petitioner under Section 482 of the BNSS is hereby dismissed.

7. The opinion expressed herein above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the respective merits of the case and the same shall be construed as the opinion expressed for deciding this bail petition only. Investigation record is hereby returned. File be consigned to the record room.

Pronounced in open Court

Date: 12.02.2026

(Parminder Singh Grewal),

Addl. Sessions Judge,

Malerkotla. UID No.PB0438

Shavinder Kumar, Stenographer Gr.-I

Mohammad Danish Ansari Vs. State of Punjab

Present : Mr. Manav Anand, Advocate for the petitioner
Mr. Harkamal Singh, Addl. P.P. for the State
Mr. RR Jain, Advocate for the complainant.

Investigation record has been received and perused.

Arguments have been heard. Vide my separate detailed order of even date, the present bail application has been dismissed as stated therein. Investigation record be returned. File be consigned to the record room.

Pronounced in open Court	(Parminder Singh Grewal),
Date: 12.02.2026	Addl. Sessions Judge,
	Malerkotla. UID No.PB0438
Shavinder Kumar, Stenographer Gr.-I	