

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

Sr. No. 107

CRM-M-18356-2017

Decided on : 22.05.2017

Suresh Vats

..... Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

The State of Haryana

..... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK SIBAL

Present: Mr.J.P.Singh, Advocate, for the petitioner(s).

DEEPAK SIBAL, J. (ORAL)

The present petition is the second one filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for the grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.177, dated 16.04.2017, registered under Sections 306 and 34 IPC, at police Station Sonapat City, District Sonapat.

The first petition filed by the petitioner being CRM-M-15766-2017 "*Suresh Vats vs. The State of Haryana*" came up for hearing before me on 05.05.2017 on which date learned counsel for the petitioner argued the matter but having received no favourable response from the Bench and not seeking to invite a decision on the merits of the case, fearing that it may prejudice him at a later stage, learned counsel for the petitioner sought to withdraw the petition which he was permitted to do by passing the following order: -

“The arguments raised on behalf of the petitioner having not received a favourable response from the Bench, learned counsel for the petitioner seeks to withdraw the present petition.

Permitted to do so.

Dismissed as withdrawn.”

Learned counsel for the petitioner very fairly submits that there is no change of circumstance after the passing of the afore-quoted order.

Even otherwise, the allegations against the petitioner are rather serious which are to the effect that the deceased had committed suicide by strangulating himself on account of consistent threats given to him by the petitioner and his co-accused. It is the case of the prosecution that prior to his death, the deceased had told his brother-in-law that his life was in danger and that the petitioner and his co-accused, who were in Delhi Police, had caused lot of mental torture to him. The deceased is alleged to have been consistently threatened by the petitioner for about six months prior to his death. During the course of such threats the petitioner is also alleged to have used his gun. The deceased had also written on the wall of his house that it is the petitioner alongwith his co-accused who are responsible for his death.

The above allegations being serious as also for the reason that there is no fresh ground after the afore-quoted order dated 05.05.2017 passed in the first petition filed by the petitioner for seeking anticipatory bail, I find no reason to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

Dismissed.

22.05.2017
shamsher

[DEEPAK SIBAL]
JUDGE

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