

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh

PARAMJIT KAUR SAINI
2015.02.13 16:19
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this document

CRM-M-41764 of 2014

Date of Decision: 13.02.2015

Sukhdev Singh

---Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab and another

---Respondents

Coram: Hon'ble Mrs. Justice Rekha Mittal

Present: Mr.B.S.Sidhu, Advocate
for the petitioner

Mr.Gazi Mohammad, DAG, Punjab
for the respondent-State

Mr. KBS Mann, Advocate
for respondent No.2

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

REKHA MITTAL, J.

The petitioner, an accused summoned to face trial in a private complaint for offence punishable under Sections 302, 201, 203, 205, 120-B of the Indian Penal Code (in short "IPC") prays for grant of regular bail pending trial.

Counsel for the petitioner inter alia contends that Sukhjeet Kaur was married to complainant Jagsir Singh (respondent No. 2) and said Sukhjeet Kaur along with her children started residing with Sukhmander Singh, brother of the petitioner since the year 2008. On the fateful day i.e. 13.8.2011, Sukhmander Singh, Sukhjeet Kaur and her children alongwith

one Anil Kumar were travelling in a car which met with an accident and as a result Lovepreet Kaur daughter of Jagsir Singh and Sukhjeet Kaur died resulting in registration of case under Section 304-A IPC. Later, Jagsir Singh filed the present complaint alleging that his daughter Lovepreet Kaur has been killed by the accused. It is further argued that only allegation against the petitioner is that in the proceedings registered qua the accident, father's name of Lovepreet Kaur has been mentioned as Sukhmander Singh instead of Jagsir Singh. It is further argued that trial proceedings are likely to take its own time and the petitioner is ready to face proceedings without any default.

Counsel for respondent No. 2 has submitted that the petitioner connived with other accused for committing murder of Lovepreet Kaur.

I have heard counsel for the parties and perused the records.

On a pointed query raised by the Court, counsel for respondent No. 2 has fairly conceded that it is not an allegation of the complainant that the present petitioner was travelling in the car which purportedly met with an accident resulting in death of Lovepreet Kaur. The petitioner is in custody since 28.8.2014 and conclusion of trial is likely to take its own time.

Without meaning to express any opinion on merits of the controversy, bail to the petitioner on his furnishing bail bonds to satisfaction of the trial court. However, the petitioner shall abide by the following conditions:-

- (i) he shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him/her from disclosing

- such facts to the Court or to any police officer; and
- (ii) he shall not leave India without previous permission of the Court.

(REKHA MITTAL)
JUDGE

13.02.2015
PARAMJIT