

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

CRM No.M-5625 of 2017 (O&M)

Date of Decision: March 01, 2017

Raj Kumar @ Raju Sain

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

Present: Mr.Amit Dhawan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr.Deep Singh, Asstt. Advocate General, Punjab
for the respondent-State.

INDERJIT SINGH, J.

Petitioner has filed this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.94 dated 10.08.2016 under Section 306 IPC registered at Police Station Kartarpur, District Jalandhar.

Notice of motion was issued. Learned State counsel appeared and contested the petition.

Police record is also available.

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

The FIR in the present case has been registered on the basis of the statement of Amit Kumar. As per the complainant, his younger brother namely Sanjiv Kumar was under tension and he and brother-in-law of his

brother Sanjiv Kumar enquired from him regarding his tension and he told that he borrowed ₹20 lakhs from Raja Sai and ₹18 lakhs from Varun Chopra on the pretext of giving them gold after bringing from outside but the person who was to bring the gold, was arrested by the Customs Department and they used to harass him. Apart from this, Deepak Kumar, Murtianwala, whose shop was in front of Jagoo Chowk Mandir, were doing the work of bookies and he was also upset from them. He borrowed money from Raju Sai and Varun Chopra and these persons, after alluring, stated that money given to him, shall be adjusted with the bookies. Sanjiv Kumar further told that he has to pay the heavy amount to the aforesaid persons as they used to harass him.

The present petitioner is named in the FIR. As per the allegations, present petitioner is one of the persons, who gave harassment to Sanjiv Kumar, due to which he committed suicide. Even, the petitioner is named in one of the suicide notes.

Keeping in view the nature and gravity of the offence and in view of the facts and circumstances of the present case and without discussing the facts of the case in minute detail and without expressing any opinion on merits of case, I do not find it a fit case where petitioner is entitled to benefit of anticipatory bail.

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

March 01, 2017
Vgulati

(INDERJIT SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes
No