

202 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

1. CRM No.M-31837 of 2014
Date of Decision: February 20, 2015
Lakhbir Singh @ Sukha Petitioner
vs.
State of Punjab Respondent

2. CRM No.M-33356 of 2014
Date of Decision: February 20, 2015
Paramjit Kaur Petitioner
vs.
State of Punjab Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present: Mr. M.S. Basra, Advocate for the petitioner
(in CRM-M No.31837 of 2014).

Mr. Vipin Mahajan, Advocate for the petitioner
(in CRM-M No.33356 of 2014).

Mr. Nikhil K. Chopra, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab
assisted by ASI Davinder Singh.

1. Whether Reporters of Local Newspapers may be allowed to see the judgment?

2. To be referred to the Reporters or not?

3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

Kuldip Singh J.(Oral)

This order of mine will dispose of CRM-M Nos.31837 and 33356 of 2014, arisen out of the same FIR.

It is alleged that Baljit Kaur (complainant) wife of Daljit Singh had a niece Jagdeep Kaur, aged about 21 years. It is further alleged that Jagdeep Kaur was engaged in village Zaffarwal. It is

further alleged that petitioner Lakhbir Singh, who is also known as Sukha used to harass Daljit Singh, husband of the complainant and used to knock at his gate and raise alarms. Daljit Singh was fed up with the harassment by the petitioner. Daljit Singh was a Security Guard in Sugar Mill, Buttar. On 13.07.2014 at about 9.00 a.m., Daljit Singh made a phone call to his wife Baljit Kaur(complainant), whereby he stated that he had consumed some poisonous substance due to harassment by Paramjit Kaur and Sukha(present petitioners). Daljit Singh died later on. A suicide note was also found, in which it was stated that the deceased had consumed some poisonous substance as his neighbours used to harass him regularly and abused him daily.

Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) has argued that some lines in the suicide note have been written with the different hand. It is stated that the petitioners have already joined the investigation.

Regarding petitioner Paramjit Kaur, this court's attention has been drawn to the decision of the civil litigation, in which Daljit Singh (deceased) compromised the matter and got ₹6,00,000/- in lieu of his share.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that the custodial interrogation of the petitioners is not required and they have been falsely involved.

After going through the facts and circumstances of the case, I am of the view that the allegations against the petitioners are very serious in nature. There are allegations that that they vigorously harassed Daljit Singh and instigated him to commit suicide.

In view of the aforesaid facts, I am of the opinion that this is not a fit case, where the extraordinary power under Section 438 Cr.P.C. should be exercised to grant anticipatory bail.

Accordingly, both the petitions stand dismissed.

February 20, 2015
sarita

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE