

CRM-M-4911-2017

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

CRM-M-4911-2017

Date of Decision: 23.02.2017

Surinder Singh @ Bhuri

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

Present: Mr. Kuldip Sanwal, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Deep Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Sandeep Godara, Advocate,
for the complainant.

INDERJIT SINGH, J.

Petitioner-Surinder Singh @ Bhuri has filed this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.220 dated 15.12.2016, registered at Police Station City-I, Abohar, District Fazilka, under Sections 364, 302, 201, 148 and 149 of the Indian Penal Code.

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

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner; learned State counsel; learned counsel for the complainant and have gone through the record.

CRM-M-4911-2017

From the record, I find that FIR has been registered on the statement of one Surjit Singh, who stated that on 20.12.2010, his younger son namely Manjit Singh @ Mithu had gone to his shop, but he did not return to the house. The complainant searched his son, but he was not found. On 25.12.2010, the complainant got registered DDR for missing of his son at Police Station Abohar. Earlier to one day of registration of FIR, Sandeep Singh came to the house of complainant and told him that when he went to Gurudwara Nanaksar, Tobha Abohar for paying obeisance where Mandeep Singh was talking with Sukhjinder Singh @ Sukha that they alongwith Surjit Singh, Baljinder Singh and Surinder Singh took Manjit Singh @ Mithu from the shop to field and by murdering him, his body had thrown in Gang Canal. Due to that bad deed, child in the womb of his wife died and it was aborted.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case; nature and gravity of the offence and in view of the facts that the petitioner has been named in the FIR and he is required for custodial interrogation, 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.

23.02.2017

parveen kumar

(INDERJIT SINGH)
JUDGE

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