

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

CRM No.M-34775 of 2018 (O&M)
Date of Decision: September 24, 2018

Gurpreet Singh

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

Present: Mr.Abhishek Jindal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms.Monika Jalota, DAG, Punjab
for the respondent-State.

INDERJIT SINGH, J.

Petitioner has filed this second petition under Section 439 Cr.P.C. for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.38 dated 05.08.2016 under Sections 365 and 506 IPC (Sections 364-A, 341, 344, 346, 384, 385, 386, 411, 34 IPC and Sections 25, 27 and 30 of the Arms Act added later on) [Sections 413, 473 and Section 27 of the Arms Act deleted later on), registered at Police Station Sadar, Budhlada.

Notice of motion was issued. Learned State counsel appeared and contested the petition.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned State counsel and have gone through the record.

From the record, I find that FIR in the present case has been

registered on the statement of Ramla Bansal on the allegations that her husband was kidnapped by the accused and she received telephonic call asking for ransom and asking that if ransom is not paid then her husband would be killed. As per the allegations, ₹1 crore was paid as ransom and complainant's husband was released after a long period.

Keeping in view the serious allegations in the present case, I do not find it a fit case where petitioner is entitled to benefit of regular bail. There is every chance of tampering with the evidence, if the petitioner is released on bail. Otherwise also, in view of the nature and gravity of the offence, no ground is made for granting bail to the petitioner.

Therefore, finding no merit in the present petition, the same is dismissed.

September 24, 2018
Vgulati

(INDERJIT SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes
No