

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

CRM-M-15688-2018(O&M)

Date of decision:-8.5.2018

Pawan Kumar Popli and another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE H.S.MADAAN

Present: Mr.Nakul Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr.Saurav Khurana, DAG, Punjab.

Mr.Raman Goklaney, Advocate
for the complainant.

H.S. MADAAN, J.

This petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for pre-arrest bail has been filed by the petitioners – Pawan Kumar Popli and Sandeep Popli @ Laddu Popli, both accused in FIR No.20 dated 23.3.2018, under Section 306 IPC, registered at Police Station City, Fazilka, District Fazilka.

Briefly stated, the prosecution story is that the FIR in this case was recorded on the basis of statement of complainant – Neha wife of Vikas Sharnma (deceased), resident of Prem Gali, Fazilka, aged about 46 years in which she stated that her deceased husband Vikas Sharma had been running a medical store and in addition to that providing taxies for hire; that her husband was under depression for last several days and on being inquired, he disclosed that on 22.3.2018, Pawan Kumar Popli and

Sandeep Popli @ Laddu Popli (present petitioners), originally residents of Fazilka, resident residing at Chandigarh were working as bookies and he had lost Rs.18 lakhs by betting on cricket; that he had borrowed money from several persons, which he was unable to repay and the creditors were harassing him; that one Ishant Verma working as Drug Inspector, Fazilka had extorted money from him under threat of involving him in a criminal case of selling intoxicant medicines; that her husband had delivered her the names of several other persons, who were harassing and threatening him; that on 22.3.2018, Vikas Sharma left home; at about 7:00 p.m., he made a telephonic call to his wife – Neha - complainant saying that due to harassment suffered by him at the hands of Pawan Kumar Popli and Sandeep Popli @ Laddu Popli (petitioners) and Sahil Baghla, Gora Puneja, Babbu Chabra, Shunty Batra and Seema, he was going to commit suicide and then he actually committed suicide. After recording of formal FIR, the matter was investigated.

Apprehending their arrest in this case, the petitioners had approached the Court of Sessions seeking grant of pre-arrest bail by filing an application, however, their such request was declined by learned Additional Sessions Judge -I, Fazilka vide order dated 11.4.2018. As such, the petitioners have approached this Court asking for the similar relief.

Notice of the petition was given to respondent – State, which put in appearance through counsel. The complainant has also appeared through counsel.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties besides going through the records.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has contended that the petitioners are innocent; that they have not committed any offence; the allegations in the FIR even if taken as correct on the face of it, those do not constitute any abetment, which is necessary ingredient of Section 306 IPC; that the petitioners are ready to join the investigation and their custodial interrogation is not necessary as no recovery is to be effected from them, therefore, they be granted pre-arrest bail.

Whereas, the request is being opposed by the learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for the complainant submitting that the petitioners are specifically named in the FIR and in the suicide note left by the deceased, therefore, custodial interrogation of the petitioners is essential and no ground is made out to grant pre-arrest bail to them.

After hearing the rival contentions of learned counsel for the parties, I find that admittedly Vikash Sharma deceased had committed suicide. As per the prosecution case, the petitioners and others named in the FIR and in the suicide note had abetted the same. There are specific allegations of harassment against the petitioners and others. We are dealing with an application for pre-arrest bail and guilt of an accused is not being decided, therefore, the minute details are not to be taken into consideration at this stage. As it comes out the complainant had specifically named the petitioners being responsible for the suicide of her husband. In the suicide note left by the deceased, he had named both the petitioners.

As regards the authority referred to by learned counsel for the petitioners i.e. **Umesh Gupta Versus State, 2005(35) AIC 765**, the same

does not find application to the present case due to different facts and circumstances and the context in which such observations have been made.

In case of *State represented by the C.B.I. Versus Anil Sharma, 1997(4) R.C.R.(Criminal) 268*, Hon'ble Apex Court had observed that custodial interrogation is qualitatively more elicitation orientated than questioning a suspect who is on anticipatory bail, in a case like this interrogation of suspected person is of tremendous advantage in getting useful informations.

Custodial interrogation of the petitioners is definitely required for complete and effective investigation. In case custodial interrogation of the petitioners is denied to the investigating agency that would leave many loose ends and gaps in the investigation affecting the investigation being carried out adversely which is not called for.

Thus finding no merit in the petition, the same stands dismissed.

8.5.2018

Brij

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

(H.S.MADAAN)
JUDGE