

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

CRM-M-31167 of 2016 (O&M)

Date of decision: 08.11.2016

Bittu Dhurala @ Joginder Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN**

Present: Mr. Aman Pal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Saurabh Mohunta, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Bhagwat Dayal, Advocate for respondent No.2.

\*\*\*\*

**Jitendra Chauhan, J. (Oral)**

By filing the present petition under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, the petitioner has sought anticipatory bail in FIR No.21, dated 10.01.2016, registered under Section 306 read with Section 34 of IPC, at Police Station City Thanesar.

It is contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case. No overt act has been attributed to the petitioner. The transaction pertains to the year 2013, whereas the death in question had taken place in January, 2016. Four names had figured in the suicide note and these persons were not known to each other.

On the other hand, the learned State counsel opposes the

bail application and states that the deceased being a small shopkeeper had been persuading the accused to make payment for the good delivered to them, however, they had been threatening the deceased which compelled him to commit suicide. He further refers to FSL report to contend that the suicide note is in hand of the deceased, Vipin Sharma.

The learned counsel for the complaint submits that during the life time of the deceased, repeated panchayats were convened, however, the petitioner continuously threatened the deceased and refused to make the payment.

Heard.

Keeping in view the specific allegations, the suicide note in which the name of the petitioner has been specifically mentioned, and the FSL report, this Court feels that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is essential. Therefore, no case for anticipatory bail is made out.

Dismissed.

Anything said herein above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

08.11.2016

*sumit.k*

**(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)**  
**JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned :

Yes

No

Whether Reportable :

Yes

No