

**HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

CRM-M-18996-2015
Date of decision:4.6.2015

Gurmanpreet Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK

1. To be referred to the Reporters or not ?
2. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest ?

Present: Mr.J.S.Bedi, Sr. Advocate with
Mr.Harpreet Multani, Advocate for the petitioner.

RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK, J. (Oral)

Petitioner seeks pre-arrest bail in FIR No.25 dated 6.4.2015 registered under Section 306 IPC at Police Station, Maloud, Police District Khanna.

Learned senior counsel for the petitioner submits that the statement under Section 161 Cr.P.C. of Harvinder Singh son of Gurdev Singh recorded by the police on 14.4.2015 was a fabricated document. It was ante dated and prepared only with a view to oppose the anticipatory bail application of the petitioner because earlier his co-accused had been granted the concession of anticipatory bail by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ludhiana, vide order dated 20.4.2015 (Annexure P-4). He also refers to the medical record of the father of the petitioner at Annexure P-5, to contend that once father of the petitioner was on death bed, there was no occasion with the petitioner to cause the alleged harassment to his wife for demanding the alleged amount. He prays for allowing the present petition.

Having heard the learned senior counsel for the petitioner at considerable length, after careful perusal of the record of the case and giving thoughtful consideration to the contentions raised, this Court is of the considered opinion that in the given fact situation of the instant case, petitioner has not been found entitled for the concession of anticipatory bail.

It is so said because the allegations levelled against the petitioner are direct

and serious. He insulted his father-in-law to such an extent that the deceased was forced to take the extreme step by committing suicide.

In view of the above and without commenting anything further on merits at this stage, lest it should prejudice the rights of either of the parties, this Court is of the considered view that custodial interrogation of the petitioner would be a compulsive necessity of the investigating agency so as to conduct an effective investigation. In this view of the matter, no case for anticipatory bail is made out.

Dismissed.

4.6.2015

mks

(RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK)

JUDGE