

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT  
CHANDIGARH

CRM No. M-19083 of 2017 (O&M)  
Date of Decision: 26.05.2017

Kamaldeep Singh Bedi

--Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

--Respondent

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA.**

Present:- Mr. Atul Goyal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. P.S. Grewal, D.A.G., Punjab.

Mr. M.S. Sachdeva, Advocate for the complainant.

\*\*\*

**TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA.J**

The present petition has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.91 dated 27.4.2017 registered under sections 341, 342, 149, 384, 511, 506 I.P.C at Police Station, Rama Mandi, District Jalandhar.

Counsel for the parties have been heard.

FIR has been registered on the complaint of Managing Director of DIPS Institutions being run in the city of Jalandhar.

The present petitioner is stated to be a self styled President of the Punjab Parents' Association.

Allegations against the present petitioner are in the nature of spearheading an agitation protesting against the school management regarding the hike of fee structure. There are specific allegations of organizing *Dharnas*/demonstrations etc. outside the school premises and thereby disrupting the normal functioning of the school and thereby putting not only the faculty staff but even the students to inconvenience. There is also a specific allegation as regards a demand having been made by the

petitioner seeking Rs.50,000/- per month as protection money.

Learned counsel representing the petitioner would submit that the FIR and the complainant's version is lacking as regards the specific date, time and mode of having raised such demand of protection money.

In so far as the petitioner portraying himself to be the President of the Punjab Parents Association, is not denied. The holding of *dharnas*/demonstrations is also not denied. Even though, counsel for the petitioner asserts that these were peaceful demonstrations and the petitioner along with other aggrieved parents were well within their rights to agitate the issue.

Learned State counsel upon instructions from ASI Paramjit Singh Nijjer as also Mr. M.S. Sachdeva, Advocate for the complainant has opposed the prayer by submitting that not only DIPS Institutions but various other educational bodies/institutions have lodged complaints against the present petitioner.

It may be noticed that Lawrence School and State Public School have got their statements recorded under Section 161 Cr.P.C during the course of investigation in the present FIR and as per which the petitioner is alleged to have indulged in the same very activity even qua such institutions. That apart, there is a complaint that was lodged by Shiv Jyoti Public School on the same lines much prior to the registration of the present FIR and in the month of March, 2017.

Situation apparently has come to such a head that the complainant/DIPS Institutions was constrained to even file a suit for permanent injunction before the competent court at Jalandhar to restrain the party/defendant (petitioner being impleaded as defendant no.1) from

causing damage to the school property/blockade/*gherao* etc.

A query during the course of hearing was even put to the counsel for the petitioner to test the antecedents of the petitioner. It was conceded that ward of the present petitioner is not a student in the complainant institution. Even his avocation in real life is totally unrelated to the field of education. This Court would be constrained to observe that the present petitioner *prima facie* appears to be a busy body and just lending his free time to spearheading such agitations which certainly do not promote the interests of the students.

During the course of hearing learned State counsel has even produced certain photographs which apparently depict the present petitioner as also certain other agitators having disrobed themselves and agitating outside an institution which, though, does not form part of the DIPS Institutions.

The allegations against the petitioner have to be viewed with some concern. The antecedents of the petitioner *prima facie* are suspect. It is a case which would require a thorough probe and may well entail even custodial interrogation of the petitioner.

For the reasons recorded above, this Court is not inclined to extend in favour of the petitioner the concession of anticipatory bail.

Petition is dismissed.

**(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)**  
**JUDGE**

**26.05.2017**

lucky

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes  
Whether Reportable: No