

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

CRM-M-36994 of 2017(O&M)

Date of Decision: 22.01.2018

Sukhdarshan Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MRS.JUSTICE LISA GILLPresent: Mr.A.S.Sekhona, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Monika Jalota, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. A.S.Dhindsa, Advocate
for the complainant.

LISA GILL, J (Oral).

Petitioner seeks the concession of anticipatory bail in FIR No. 181 dated 07.08.2017, under Sections 306/34 IPC, registered at Police Station City/Kotwali Faridkot.

It is submitted that at the outset no allegation was raised against anyone by the complainant when his daughter died on the intervening night of 04/05.10.2016. The complainant stated that she has died due to taking wrong medicines. At a much later stage, an application was submitted on 08.06.2017 before the Additional Director General of Police, Punjab, where certain financial transactions between the complainant and his son-in-law are averred. It is further stated therein that complainant's daughter was subjected to ill-treatment by the petitioner. Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that had there been any truth in the allegations the complainant would necessarily have raised the same at the initial stage itself. It is thus prayed that this petition be allowed.

Learned counsel for the complainant points out that the matter was immediately reported to the Police. Intimation was given at the police

helpline No. 181 on 05.10.2016 at 03.09 a.m. The complainant's statement was not faithfully recorded by the police authorities. CRM-M-253 of 2017 was filed by the complainant's son seeking directions in this respect. A status report was called for in the said proceedings and it is specifically stated that the matter was investigated and the present FIR was thereafter registered on 07.08.2017.

Learned counsel for the State points out that as per investigation, it is revealed that there were certain financial transactions between the petitioner and his father-in-law. It is submitted that application dated 01.10.2016 was filed by the victim herself prior to her death (though it is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that the matter stood amicably resolved). This fact in itself, it is argued shows the culpability of the petitioner.

Heard learned counsel for the parties, at length.

Specific and grave allegations have been levelled against the petitioner. Filing of CRM-M-253 of 2017 is not in dispute. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case, I do not find any ground whatsoever to afford the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

Petition is accordingly dismissed.

It is clarified that the observations in this order are solely confined for the purpose of decision of this petition and shall have no bearing on the investigation/trial of the case.

22.01.2018
s.khan

[LISA GILL]
Judge

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No.

Whether reportable : Yes/No.