

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

**CRM-M-19053-2018
Date of decision: 07.05.2018**

Surjit Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JAISHREE THAKUR

Present:- Mr. Amit Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

JAISHREE THAKUR, J. (Oral)

This petition has been filed under Section 439(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure for cancellation of bail granted to respondent No. 2 Rajinder Prasad in case FIR No. 78 dated 12.09.2017, registered under Sections 363, 366-A, 376 and 120-B of the IPC and Section 6 of the POCSO Act at Police Station Ramdass, District Amritsar, by an order dated 03.11.2017 passed by this Court in **CRM-M-40717-2017** (Annexure P-3).

In brief, the facts are that the aforesaid FIR came to be registered by Surjit Singh (petitioner herein) stating therein that his daughter Khushpreet Kaur was missing and that his daughter was enticed away by a boy, namely Pardeep Kumar @ Balram @ Deepu son of Baldev Raj, with an intention to perform marriage with her. It transpired that the couple solemnized a marriage and they sought protection from this Court by way of filing a petition bearing **CRM-M-35546-2017** which was allowed by this Court on 21.09.2017. Thereafter, respondent No. 2 Rajinder Prasad filed CRM-M-40717-2017 for grant of regular bail by contending that he had been taken into custody on 25.09.2017, however, he had been falsely

implicated in the FIR. Regular bail was granted to respondent No. 2 Rajinder Prasad by order dated 03.11.2017 which the petitioner herein seeks to have revoked.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that there is every likelihood that respondent No. 2, who is the uncle of Pradeep Kumar @ Balram @ Deepu, will influence the complainant and his daughter who is now residing with him.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and find no ground made out to cancel the regular bail that has been allowed to respondent No. 2. There is no substantial evidence on record to support the said apprehension other than the bald allegations made out in the petition that petitioner is apprehending that respondent No. 2 would influence or threaten the petitioner and his daughter.

Therefore, the present petition is dismissed leaving it open to the petitioner herein to approach the Court again in case there is any actual threat made out other than the mere apprehension.

07.05.2018

Waseem Ansari

(JAISHREE THAKUR)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No