

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

**Criminal Misc. No. M-19795 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of decision: 02.06.2016**

Rajwinder Singh

..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. Pardeep Singh Mirpur, 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.0033 dated 11.03.2016 registered under Section 306 of Indian Penal Code at Police Station Maur, District Bathinda.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the case whereas he has no concern as no abetment was there on his part. The dispute was between the complainant and the husband of the deceased and there was no reason to involve the present petitioner in any manner. Learned counsel also submits that no specific allegation has been levelled against the petitioner.

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

As per allegations levelled in the FIR, the petitioner gave

beatings to the deceased with cruelty. The deceased was taken to the hospital by the neighbourers where she died as she consumed pesticide in front of house of the petitioner after beatings were given by him. It is the matter of investigation as to what was the relation between the petitioner and the deceased. The relationship of the complainant as well as of the petitioner with the deceased is also disputed as different stand has been adopted by the complainant. It cannot be said that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the case as nothing has been pointed out as to whether there was any litigation between the parties or some other reason was there to falsely implicate the petitioner.

Simply by saying that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the case is not a ground to release him on anticipatory bail as three different versions have come in the allegations with regard to relation of the deceased and the petitioner, for which, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required.

Accordingly, there is no merit in the contentions raised by learned counsel for the petitioner and the petition being devoid of any merit is hereby dismissed.

02.06.2016
neetu

(DAYA CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE