courtkutchehry.com

Company: Sol Infotech Pvt. Ltd.
Website: www.courtkutchehry.com
Printed For:
Date: 13/11/2025

(2013) 09 P&H CK 0380

High Court Of Punjab And Haryana At Chandigarh

Case No: Criminal Miscellaneous No. M-19773 of 2013 (O and M)

Yuvraj Wasan		APPELLANT
	Vs	
State of Haryana		RESPONDENT

Date of Decision: Sept. 13, 2013

Acts Referred:

- Penal Code, 1860 (IPC) - Section 34, 406, 498A, 506

Hon'ble Judges: Naresh Kumar Sanghi, J

Bench: Single Bench

Advocate: Manoj Bajaj, for the Appellant; Chetan Sharma, AAG, Haryana, for the Respondent

Final Decision: Dismissed

Judgement

Naresh Kumar Sanghi, J.

Prayer in this petition is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, Yuvraj Wasan, who has been booked for having committed the offences punishable under Sections 406, 498-A, 506 read with Section 34, IPC, in a case arising out of FIR No. 100, dated 14.04.2013, registered at Police Station, Sector 40, Gurgaon. Learned counsel contends that it is the second marriage of the petitioner and that of complainant; that from the perusal of the FIR, the ingredients of the offences for which the petitioner has been booked, are not made out; that due to incompatible behaviour, the complainant could not pull on well with the petitioner which resulted into the registration of the present FIR.

2. On the other hand, learned counsel for the State submits that the petitioner is the husband of the complainant.

3. The allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. The complainant is a qualified doctor and it is unlikely that she would level the false allegations against her husband. He further submits that while lodging the report to the police, the complainant had alleged that at the time of proposal for marriage, the petitioner

disclosed the wrong facts with regard of his service and status. After the marriage, the complainant was mentally and physically tortured by the petitioner as has been detailed in the FIR.

4. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and gone through the material available on record.

5. Perusal of the FIR (Annexure P-1) reveals that at the time of proposal for marriage with the complainant, wrong facts were presented by the petitioner. After the marriage, the complainant found that the petitioner was not a pilot in the Airlines Company. It has also been alleged that after the marriage, the petitioner started harassing the complainant and one day, the petitioner after closing the main door of the flat decamped with the valuables of the complainant.

6. The allegations against the petitioner as enumerated in the FIR are serious in nature. The custodial interrogation of the petitioner appears to be justified in the present case. No ground for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner is made out. Dismissed.