

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

**Criminal Misc. No. M-19393 of 2016 (O&M)  
Date of decision: 31.05.2016**

**Kamaldeep Singh @ Kamal**

**..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. Hemender Goswami, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

\*\*\*

**Daya Chaudhary, J. (Oral)**

This petition has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.46 dated 20.04.2016 registered under Sections 363, 366-A, 506 and 120-B of Indian Penal Code at Police Station Meharban, Ludhiana.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the case whereas no role has been attributed to him. The petitioner was only present at the place of occurrence. As per allegations levelled in the FIR, the petitioner gave threats to the complainant. The girl has already been recovered and nothing is to be recovered from the petitioner. The petitioner is ready to join investigation.

Heard arguments of learned counsel for the petitioner and have also perused the allegations levelled in the FIR.

Admittedly, the victim is 13 years of age and she has been

enticed away by co-accused of the petitioner, namely, Simran. The present petitioner was also present when the victim was recovered. Not only the petitioner gave threats to the complainant but has stated that the victim was to be taken to Gurudwara for getting her married with Simran and arrangements have been made as well. It is also mentioned in the FIR that all the accused threatened the complainant to kill him and told that they are not going to hand over the victim to him. Thereafter, with the help of other persons, the victim was taken away by the complainant.

On perusal of allegations levelled in the FIR, it is apparent that the petitioner was not only present at the spot but he has played an active role as well as threats were given to the complainant by him. The petitioner has been alleged to have made all arrangements of the marriage at Gurudwara where victim was taken.

Keeping in view the seriousness of the offence and the role of the petitioner, no ground is made out to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

Dismissed.

**31.05.2016**  
**neetu**

**(DAYA CHAUDHARY)**  
**JUDGE**