

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

(1)

Criminal Misc.No.M-23261 of 2015 (O&M)

Date of Decision: September 03, 2015.

Sunil Yadav

.....PETITIONER(s).

VERSUS

State of Haryana and another

....RESPONDENT(s).

(2)

Criminal Misc.No.M-23270 of 2015 (O&M)

Sunil Yadav

.....PETITIONER(s).

VERSUS

State of Haryana and another

....RESPONDENT(s).

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURINDER GUPTA

Present: Mr. S.K.Yadav, Advocate
for the applicant (s).

Mr. Subhash Chander, D.A.G. Haryana.

Mr. Manjeet Singh Randhawa, Advocate
for respondent No.2 in CRM-M-23261-2015.

SURINDER GUPTA, J.

Both the aforementioned petitions have been filed under
Section 439(2) Code of Criminal Procedure for cancellation of

anticipatory bail granted to respondent No.2 in both the petitions vide order dated 29.06.2015 in case FIR No.176 dated 13.05.2015 registered for the offences punishable under Section 306 read with Section 34 of Indian Penal Code, at Police Station City Narnaul, District Mohindergarh.

Heard.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that there was misrepresentation of facts. In fact, the accounts referred while seeking anticipatory bail were the loan accounts of deceased and his wife and not their saving accounts. He has placed on file the copies of those accounts as Annexure P/2 and P/3, which show that the account of wife of deceased was a housing loan account and the account of the deceased was a cash credit limit allowed to him.

The allegations in the suicide note are against respondent No.2 in both the petitions and various other persons to the effect that the deceased had taken loan from them and they were charging exorbitant interest on principal.

It is a case where the police has to get the facts mentioned in the suicide note verified. Learned State counsel submits that the investigation is still in progress and the police is verifying the allegations mentioned in the suicide note. The accused/private respondents have joined the investigation.

Keeping in view the allegations in the FIR, the matter requires thorough investigation. The private respondents/accused have

already joined the investigation and there is no allegation that they are either not co-operating in investigation or are, in any manner, creating any obstacle in investigation by influencing or coercing any witness.

At this stage, I find no reason to cancel the anticipatory bail granted to respondent No.2 in both the petitions vide order dated 29.06.2015.

There is no merit in both the petitions. Dismissed.

September 03, 2015.
Sachin M.

(SURINDER GUPTA)
JUDGE