

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

CRM-M No.38120 of 2015 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 29.02.2016

Tejinder Singh Mangat

..... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASWANT SINGH

Present: Mr. D.S.Dalee, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Kirat Singh Sidhu, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab
for the respondent/State assisted by A.S.I. Jarnail Singh.

Mr. Anil Kumar Garg, Advocate for the complainant.

JASWANT SINGH, J. (Oral)

CRM No.3654 of 2016

Prayer is for placing on record the documents as **Annexures R-2/1**
and **R-2/3**.

Application is allowed. Documents are taken on record.

CRM No.3655 of 2016

Prayer is for impleading Palwinder Kaur widow of late Sh. Jagtar
Singh, r/o Village Fatehgarh Panjgraian as respondent No.2/complainant.

For the reasons mentioned in the application, the same is allowed.
Palwinder Kaur is permitted to be impleaded as respondent No.2/complainant.
Amended Memo of Parties is taken on record.

MAIN CASE

The prayer is for grant of anticipatory bail under Section 438
Cr.P.C. to the petitioner/accused-Tejinder Singh Mangat in case FIR No.35

dated 18.07.2015, under Section 306 of the Indian Penal Code, registered with Police Station Sherpur, District Sangrur.

It is alleged by the complainant-Palwinder Kaur that her husband-Jagtar Singh after selling his land and tractor had some months back given Rs.6.5 Lacs to the present accused-Tejinder Singh Mangat and another sum of Rs.2.5 Lacs to co-accused Amandeep Singh @ Amna and his accused wife Karamjit Kaur.

Since they had refused to refund the amount in spite of repeated requests, the deceased husband was under acute stress and tension on losing his means of livelihood. As inspite of repeated requests, the money was not returned, he consumed some poisonous substance and committed suicide.

The prayer for grant of anticipatory bail being based on a Panchayati Compromise dated 06.08.2015 (**Annexure P-2**), this Court vide order dated 06.11.2015 granted interim bail to the petitioner. Subsequently, the complainant through her Counsel has stressed that the said settled terms of the compromise as reflected in the additional affidavit dated 06.08.2015 to the Panchayati Compromise were not adhered, the present accused having failed to pay Rs.6.5 Lacs out of the total payment of Rs.9 Lacs, thus there is no compromise.

In view of the above fact, it is apparent that the interim protection granted was only in the light of the compromise and there be no compromise as per the stand of the complainant, no case for grant of anticipatory bail is made out.

Accordingly, the present petition stands dismissed.

February 29, 2016

Gagan

(JASWANT SINGH)
JUDGE