

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

CRM-M No. 34570 of 2015

Date of decision : 20.11.2015

Inderjeet Singh

..... Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI

Present: Mr. SPS Chakkal, Advocate for the petitioner.
Ms.Amarjit Kaur Khurana, Addl.AG, Punjab.

1. Whether Reporters of local papers 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?

AJAY TEWARI, J. (Oral)

This is a petition for anticipatory bail filed in case bearing FIR No. 125 dated 23.07.2015, under Section 306 IPC, registered at Police Station Morinda, District Roopnagar, Punjab.

On the last date i.e. 15.10.2015 the following order was passed:-

“The petitioner seeks grant of anticipatory bail.

Counsel for the petitioner has argued that the deceased committed suicide for some reason of her own and the petitioner had no role in abetting her suicide.

Learned Addl. AG Punjab, on instructions from Gurnam Singh, has argued that a perusal of the suicide note reveals that it was something that the petitioner had done which had caused the deceased to commit suicide

and, therefore, his custodial interrogation is required to determine the exact relationship between the deceased and the petitioner.

Counsel for the petitioner has further argued that even in the suicide note the petitioner is not named, and that the suicide note which is the only substantive piece of evidence in this case does not give rise to the conclusion that the petitioner had abetted the same in any manner.

Without going into merits of the case, in my opinion it would be in the interest of justice if the petitioner appears before the Investigating Officer on 28.10.2015 or on any other day on which the Investigating Officer requires his presence, and in the event of his arrest, the petitioner shall be released on interim anticipatory bail by the Investigating Officer to his satisfaction subject to the compliance of the provisions as contained in Section 438(2) of the Cr.P.C. Ordered accordingly.

Adjourned to 20.11.2015 to await the report of the Investigating Officer.”

Today learned counsel has argued that it was a case where the parties were both in contact with each other and even the deceased had so many times contacted the petitioner. Learned Addl.AG, on instructions from HC Surinder Singh, has accepted this fact.

In the circumstances the order dated 15.10.2015 is made absolute.

Petition stands disposed of.

(AJAY TEWARI)
JUDGE

November 20 , 2015

sunita