

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

Criminal Misc. No. M-27205 of 2015
Date of decision: 07.09.2015

D.C. @ Sukhwinder Singh

..Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE DAYA CHAUDHARY

- 1. Whether reporters of local newspapers may be allowed to see judgment? Yes/No**
- 2. To be referred to reporters or not? Yes/No**
- 3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest? Yes/No**

Present: Mr. Tarunveer Vashist, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rupam Aggarwal, DAG, Punjab
for the respondent – State.

Daya Chaudhary, J. (Oral)

The present petition has been filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C. on behalf of the petitioner-D.C. @ Sukhwinder Singh for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.52 dated 25.04.2013, under Sections 363, 366 and 120-B of Indian Penal Code registered at Police Station City Malout, District Sri Muktsar Sahib.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the case whereas no offence is made out under Sections 363, 366 IPC. The petitioner and daughter of the complainant, namely, Amandeep Kaur have solemnized marriage and the petitioner was arrested in the case even after making statement by Amandeep Kaur before this Court in Criminal Writ Petition No.885 of 2013 filed by her father. The daughter of the

complainant was allowed to meet him and she was allowed to go to the place of her choice vide order dated 26.02.2015. Now she is residing in her matrimonial house. Learned counsel further submits that the petitioner is behind the bars since 02.03.2015. Learned counsel also submits that the case before the trial Court is fixed for prosecution evidence and no purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner in custody.

Learned State counsel has not disputed the factum of filing Criminal Writ Petition No.885 of 2013 by father of Amandeep Kaur as well as statement made by Amandeep Kaur before this Court and the stage of trial.

Keeping in view the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner and daughter of the complainant have solemnized marriage; and daughter of the complainant is residing happily in her matrimonial life; on the basis of statement made by Amandeep Kaur before this Court; she was allowed to the place of her choice and the petitioner is in custody since 02.03.2015; and no purpose would be served by keeping him in custody, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner (D.C. @ Sukhwinder Singh) is directed to be released on regular bail subject to furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

07.09.2015
neetu

(DAYA CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE