

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

CRM-M-7710 of 2017 (O&M)

Date of decision: 10.05.2017

Apar Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. S.S. Virk, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Saurabh Mohunta, DAG, Haryana.

None for respondent No.2.

Jitendra Chauhan, J. (Oral)

CRM-9044-2017

Allowed as prayed for, subject to all just exceptions.

Main Case

By filing the present petition, under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, the petitioner has sought anticipatory bail in FIR No. 21 dated 10.01.2016, registered under Section 306 read with Section 34 of IPC, at Police Station City Thanesar, District Kurukshetra.

It is contended that in view of the allegations, the ingredients of Section 306 of IPC are not made out against the petitioner. The petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case being the father of co-accused, Harman. Said Harman has been admitted to regular bail by the trial Court.

On the other hand, the learned State counsel opposes the bail

application and states that the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner are against the record. Even as per the suicide note, the petitioner had dealing with deceased, Vipin Sharma. The FSL report with regard to suicide note has been obtained which proves the veracity of the suicide note.

Heard.

Considering the fact that specific circumstances created by the petitioner along with co-accused as reflected in the suicide note which indicates that the deceased, a small shopkeeper, had no option except to commit suicide. Keeping in view the gravity of offence, no case for pre-arrest bail is made out at this stage.

Dismissed.

Anything said herein above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

10.05.2017

sumit.k

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

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