

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.24995 of 2016 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 04.08.2016

Kuldeep Singh

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab and another

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANITA CHAUDHRY

Present: Mr.Ravish Bansal, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. VPS Sidhu, AAG, Punjab,
counsel for the respondent-State.

Mr. Sumeet Puri, Advocate
for the complainant.

-*-

ANITA CHAUDHRY, J.

The petitioner has filed this petition seeking anticipatory bail in FIR no.52 dated 21.06.2016 registered under Sections 306, 120-B IPC at Police Station Sadar Sunam, District Sangrur.

Counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is the husband of Harvinder Kaur and they were married in 1999 and they have three children and eldest is 17 years old. The counsel urges that the wife was over-sensitive and she was under depression after the death of her father and there are no allegations of instigation and the case would not fall under the definition of Section 306 IPC.

The complainant side has appeared and opposes the prayer and has produced some photographs and it is stated that there appear to be injury marks on her face and they have filed a petition as the girl had been murdered because she was objecting to the illicit relationship of petitioner with Jasbir Kaur. Counsel urges that Jasbir Kaur used to stay in front of their house and had shifted out but had been meeting the petitioner and the wife was objecting. The counsel also states that Gurjant Singh, father of the petitioner is working in the same hospital in which the postmortem examination was carried out and they have sought directions for getting another report from the doctor.

The State counsel states that the petitioner had admitted that the wife used to suspect him and that is the reason given for the suicide and he had also admitted that Jasbir Kaur used to come to the shop and grocery worth Rs.16,000/- on credit had been given to Jasbir Kaur whereas no such credit was given to any other customer and the petitioner was giving special favours to her which indicates about his relationship.

Considering the above, I am not inclined to grant the discretionary relief of anticipatory bail. The allegations are serious. The petition is dismissed.

(ANITA CHAUDHRY)
JUDGE

04.08.2016

Sunil

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No