

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

**CRM-M-2218-2017
Date of decision-24.04.2017**

Kaur Singh

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. H.R.Bhardwaj, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Harsimrat Rai, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. B.S.Sidhu, Advocate
for respondent Nos 2 to 4.

JITENDRA CHAUHAN, J. (Oral)

This petition has been filed under Section 439(2) Cr.P.C. read with Section 482 Cr.P.C. for cancellation of anticipatory bail granted to respondent Nos.2 to 4 vide order dated 06.10.2016 (Annexure P-2) by the this Court in FIR No.0118 dated 22.07.2016 registered under Sections 419, 420, 465, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B of Indian Penal Code (in short 'IPC'), at Police Station City Kotkapura, District Faridkot.

It is contended that respondent Nos.2 to 4 have misused the concession of bail granted by this Court. After getting the concession of bail, the private respondents have started threatening the petitioner and his family members with dire consequences and interfering into the peaceful possession of the land. Learned counsel for the petitioner further contends that custodial interrogation of respondent Nos.2 to 4 is necessary.

On the other hand, learned State counsel on instructions states that there is no truth in the allegations of the petitioner and opposes the

cancellation of bail application.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

In *Kalyan Chandra Sarkar Vs. Rajesh Ranjan @ Pappu Yadav and Anr., 2004 (2) R.C.R.(Criminal) 254: 2004 (7) SCC 528,*

Hon'ble the Supreme Court held as under:-

“11. The law in regard to grant or refusal of bail is very well settled. The court granting bail should exercise its discretion in a judicious manner and not as a matter of course. Though at the stage of granting bail a detailed examination of evidence and elaborate documentation of the merit of the case need not be undertaken, there is a need to indicate in such orders reasons for prima facie concluding why bail was being granted particularly where the accused is charged of having committed a serious offence. Any order devoid of such reasons would suffer from non-application of mind. It is also necessary for the court granting bail to consider among other circumstance, the following factors also before granting bail; they are:

- (a) The nature of accusation and the severity of punishment in case of conviction and the nature of supporting evidence.
- (b) Reasonable apprehension of tampering with the witness or apprehension of threat to the complainant.
- (c) Prima facie satisfaction of the court in support of the charge.”

A three-member Bench of Hon'ble the Supreme Court in *State (Delhi Administration) V. Sanjay Gandhi 1978 (2) SCC 411* made the

following elemental distinction in defining the nature of exercise while cancelling bail:

“Rejection of bail when bail is applied for is one thing; cancellation of bail already granted is quite another, it is easier to reject a bail application in a non-bailable case than to cancel a bail already granted in such a case. Cancellation of bail necessarily involves the review of a decision already made and can by and large be permitted only if, by reason of supervening circumstances, it would be no longer conducive to a fair trial to allow the accused to retain his freedom during the trial.”

In the instant case, nothing has been brought on record to substantiate the fact that respondent Nos.2 to 4 are misusing the concession of bail granted to them vide order dated 06.10.2016, no case for cancellation of bail is made out at this stage.

Consequently, the instant petition is devoid of merit and is hereby dismissed.

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

April 24, 2017
vanita

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes	No
Whether Reportable :	Yes	No