

CRM-M-28776-2017

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

CRM-M-28776-2017

Date of Decision: 30.11.2017

Gurpreet Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

Present: Mr. Anmol Rattan Sidhu, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Daljit Singh, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. K.S.Aulakh, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Varlin Garg, Advocate,
for the complainant.

INDERJIT SINGH, J.

Petitioner-Gurpreet Singh has filed this petition under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.38 dated 05.08.2016, registered at Police Station Sadar Budhlada, under Sections 365 and 506 of IPC (additionally charge-sheeted by adding Sections 364-A, 341, 344, 346, 384, 385, 386, 411 and 34 IPC and Sections 25, 27 and 30 of the Arms Act, 1959 and by deleting Sections 413 and 473 of IPC and Section 27 of the Arms Act, 1959).

Notice of motion was issued. Learned State counsel appeared on behalf of respondent-State and complainant also appeared through her counsel. They contested the instant petition.

CRM-M-28776-2017

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

From the record, I find that as per the allegations in the FIR, husband of the complainant was kidnapped. The complainant received a telephonic call at about 10.15 P.M and ransom was demanded, otherwise threat to kill was given. It is also the case of prosecution that ransom of ₹1 crore has been paid. Statements of private witnesses have not been completed so far. There is every chance of tampering with the evidence.

Otherwise also, keeping in view the nature and gravity of the offence, I do not find it a fit case where the petitioner is entitled to the benefit of regular bail.

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

As the petitioner has been in custody since 25.03.2015, trial Court is directed to conclude the trial expeditiously by giving short adjournments or even by adjourning the case on day to day basis, if necessary. The Investigating Officer/SHO concerned is directed to produce the witnesses before the trial Court at the earliest.

30.11.2017
parveen kumar

(INDERJIT SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes
Whether reportable	:	No