

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

CRM-M-12151 of 2015
Date of Decision: 20.04.2015

Inderjit SinghPetitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SNEH PRASHAR

Present: Mr. Harjeet Savra, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. A.S. Klar, AAG, Punjab

SNEH PRASHAR, J.

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure (Cr.P.C.) for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case First Information Report No.20 dated 24.02.2015, under Section 382 of the Indian Penal Code registered at Police Station, S.B.S. Nagar, District Nawashahahr.

2. Precisely, the accusation against the petitioner is that he hired three miscreants and got attacked his wife Parminder Kaur-complainant on 24.02.2015 at about 10:30 am. After the complainant reported the incident to the police stating that some unknown three persons had tried to rob her and had assaulted her and the investigations commenced, it transpired that the petitioner was the main person behind the incident of assault/robbery. In her statement recorded under

Section 164 Cr.P.C. the complainant stated that there was a matrimonial

dispute going on between her and her husband-Inderjit Singh, who was insisting her to consent to a divorce as he was having extra marital affair with one Manjit Kaur.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that the occurrence of robbery was result of pre-planning/conspiracy on part of the petitioner. In any case, the persons who attacked on the complainant and robbed her have since been arrested. Nothing remains to be recovered from the petitioner and as such he be given the benefit of anticipatory bail.

4. Apparently, there are serious allegations against the petitioner. Breaching the relationship of trust, he conspired and hired assailants to attack his wife and rob her.

In view of the facts and circumstances and without going into the merits of the case and least any expression above may prejudice the case of either side, in my considered opinion, the petitioner is not entitled to the concession of anticipatory bail and the instant petition is dismissed.

April 20, 2015
rashmi

(SNEH PRASHAR)
JUDGE