

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

(i) CRM No.M-13739 of 2017 (O&M)

Gurpreet Singh and another

...Petitioners

VERSUS

State of U.T. Chandigarh

...Respondent

(ii) CRM No.M-15232 of 2017 (O&M)

Parminder Singh

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of U.T. Chandigarh

...Respondent

Date of Decision: August 08, 2017

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

Present: Mr.Bhupinder Ghai, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr.Rajiv Sharma, Addl. Public Prosecutor,
for the respondent-U.T. Chandigarh.

INDERJIT SINGH, J.

Both the above-mentioned cases are taken up together as the same have arisen from same FIR.

Petitioners have filed these petitions under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.03 dated 06.01.2017 under Sections 307 and 34 IPC (Section 302 IPC added later on), registered at

Notice of motion was issued. Learned Addl. Public Prosecutor for U.T. Chandigarh appeared and contested the petitions.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioners as well as learned Addl. Public Prosecutor and have gone through the record.

From the record, I find that the petitioners are named in the FIR and active role has been attributed to them. Petitioners Gurpreet Singh and Satwinder Kaur, are father-in-law and mother-in-law respectively, of complainant Amrita whereas petitioner Parminder Singh is brother of husband of Amrita. In the present case, statement of Rajni, who was stated to have been burnt by present petitioners has been recorded by learned Magistrate, in which, she has made statement against the petitioners by stating that she along with Amrita had gone to in-laws house of Amrita, where her parents-in-law, brother of the husband and 2-3 persons poured oil (petrol) on her and put her on fire.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, serious allegations against the petitioners and in view of the statement of Rajni (deceased) given to learned Magistrate and without discussing the facts in minute detail and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, I do not find it a fit case where petitioners are entitled to benefit of anticipatory bail.

Therefore, finding no merit in both the petitions, the same are dismissed.

August 08, 2017
Vgulati

(INDERJIT SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes
No