

CRM-M-17040-2017

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

CRM-M-17040-2017

Date of Decision: 19.05.2017

Mandeep Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

Present: Mr. Mandeep Kaushik, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. V.P.S.Sidhu, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Sunny K. Singla, Advocate,
for the complainant.

INDERJIT SINGH, J.

Petitioner-Mandeep Singh has filed this petition under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.11 dated 15.01.2017, registered at Police Station Jodhan, District Ludhiana, under Section 306 IPC and Sections 498-A, 406, 427 and 120-B IPC, added later on.

Notice of motion was issued in this case. Learned State counsel has put in appearance on behalf of the respondent-State and complainant also appeared through her counsel. They contested this petition.

CRM-M-17040-2017

I have heard learned counsel for the parties as well as learned State counsel and have gone through the record.

From the record, I find that FIR, in the present case, has been got registered by complainant-Daljit Kaur. As per the prosecution version, daughter of complainant was married with the present petitioner, who had already solemnized court marriage with Sukhbir Kaur. However, Mandeep Singh and his family did not tell all these facts to him before the marriage. Mandeep Singh sent their daughter-Manpreet Kaur to their house. As per the allegations, husband of the complainant made the petitioner understand and requested him not to destroy the life of his daughter and asked him not to live with Sukhvir Kaur, but the petitioner told him that he will leave his daughter and not live with her. Thereafter, Sukhdev Singh committed suicide. In the present FIR, offences under Section 498-A, 406, 427 and 120-B IPC have been added later on.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case and in view of the fact that the petitioner is the main accused in the FIR and serious allegations are against him, I do not find it a fit case where the petitioner is entitled to the benefit of anticipatory bail.

Therefore, finding no merit in the present petition, the same is dismissed.

19.05.2017
parveen kumar

(INDERJIT SINGH)
JUDGE

Note: Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes
Whether reportable : No