

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

Crl. Misc. No.M-20780 of 2018

Date of Decision: 01.06.2018

Tajinder Singh @ Toti @ Tarlochan Singh	...Petitioner
Versus	
State of Punjab	...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present: Mr. S.S. Gill, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. J.S. Walia, Sr. DAG, Punjab.
Mr. Ish Puneet Singh, Advocate, for the complainant.
...

Amol Rattan Singh, J. (Oral)

Despite learned counsel for the petitioner having pointed to Section 107 of the IPC, to submit that simply a notice issued to vacate a property cannot be interpreted to be instigation to a person to commit suicide, however, learned State counsel having submitted that as per the investigation carried out so far, the petitioner and his accomplice other than issuing legal notice to the deceased to vacate a particular property, also pressurized him, thereby leading to the suicide, which is as per statements made by the people of the village.

Learned counsel for the complainant reiterates the same.

Without making any comment on the actual culpability of the petitioner or otherwise, having perused the suicide note also, in the opinion of this Court, it is not a case where the petitioner can be granted concession of anticipatory bail.

Consequently, the petition is dismissed, with the interim order dated 16.05.2018 stands vacated.

Nothing stated hereinafore or in the previous orders passed by this Court shall be construed as an observation on the actual merits of the case for or against the petitioner, which would be gone into by the investigating agency and the competent court at the appropriate stage, all observations having been made herein above only in the context of whether the petitioner is to be admitted to anticipatory bail or not.

01.06.2018
vcgarg/nitin

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking: Yes
Whether reportable: Yes