

**101+203 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

**CRM-3850 of 2015 in/and
CRM-M-38340 of 2014**

Date of Decision: 5.2.2015

Gurinderjit Singh

....Petitioner

vs.

State of Punjab

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present: Mr. Pankaj Bhardwaj, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Nikhil, K. Chopra, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. C.L. Pawar, Advocate
for the complainant.

Kuldip Singh J.(Oral)

CRM-3850 of 2015

This is an application under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for
placing on record copy of the challan (Annexure P-6).

For the reasons mentioned therein, same is
allowed.

Copy of challan (Annexure P-6) is taken on record.

CRM-M-38340 of 2014

The allegations against the present petitioner are
that he was continuously raping the prosecutrix since 2013 and he
even made her video film and was blackmailing her. On 13.10.2014
he went to the house of the prosecutrix and tried to forcibly take her

with him and when she objected to it, he tore her clothes and tried to rape her. As a result of which he was attacked by prosecutrix and her parents. It also comes out that the petitioner had also lodged an FIR No. 194 dated 16.10.2014 regarding the incident of beating him on 13.10.2014 alleging that he was given injuries with sword by Baljit Singh Saini-father of the prosecutrix, Injury with the reverse side of knife by Charanjit Kaur-mother of prosecutrix and brick blow on the left cheek of by the prosecutrix. Injury No. 2 and 3 have been found blunt in nature. Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that it is a counter-blast to the FIR registered against the prosecutrix and her family. He also stated that this fact of alleged rape came into notice of the parents in 2013 and there was a delay in reporting the matter to the police after that FIR was registered against prosecutrix and her parents. The allegations are very serious. Medico-legally examination of the prosecutrix is supporting the allegations levelled by her. Cross-version is to be verified particularly about injury No. 2 and 3.

In these circumstances, I am of the view that it is not a fit case where extra ordinary powers under Section 438 Cr.P.C. should be exercised to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

Petition is accordingly dismissed.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

5.2.2015
Ishant