

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

**Crl. Misc. No.M-21250 of 2018 (O&M)
Date of Decision: September 21, 2018.**

Pawan Kumar Dand

.....PETITIONER(s).

VERSUS

State of Punjab and another

.....RESPONDENT(s).

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURINDER GUPTA

Present: Mr. Sunny K. Singla, Advocate
for the petitioner (s).

Mr. Ramandeep S. Sandhu, Sr. DAG Punjab.

Mr. Karan Gupta, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

SURINDER GUPTA, J.(Oral)

The present petition has been filed under Section 439(2) Code of Criminal Procedure for cancellation of anticipatory bail granted to respondent No.2 vide order dated 03.04.2018 passed by learned Sessions Judge, Sangrur in case FIR No.18 dated 26.03.2018 registered for the offences punishable under Section 306 read with Section 34 of Indian Penal Code, at Police Station City Ahmedgarh, District Sangrur.

Heard.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that learned trial Court has not seen the gravity of the offence while allowing anticipatory bail to respondent No.2.

As per case of the prosecution, Govind Dand had purchased

gold jewellery from respondent No.2 for the marriage of his daughter but had not paid the money. On 21.03.2018 at about 8.30 a.m, Govind Dand along with his wife had gone to Gaushala Ahmedgarh, where respondent No.2 and his wife met them and demanded their money. They also threatened to go to the matrimonial home of daughter of Govind Dand and take back the gold ornaments and to defame him by coming to his shop. Due to this reason, Govind Dand took the extreme step of committing suicide.

Though the allegations have been levelled that respondent No.2 had threatened to go to the matrimonial home of daughter of deceased and to come to his shop to defame him but there is no allegation that respondent No.2 had ever gone to the matrimonial house of daughter of the deceased or had come to his shop. It has not been alleged that respondent No.2 has ever misused the concession of bail at any point of time.

In view of the above, I find no reason to cancel the anticipatory bail allowed to respondent No.2. This petition has no merits.

Dismissed.

September 21, 2018

Sachin M.

**(SURINDER GUPTA)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned:

Yes/No

Whether Reportable:

Yes/No