

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

CRM No.M-43571 of 2018 (O&M)

Date of Decision: October 08, 2018

Bhim Singh

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

Present: Mr.R.K.Agnihotri, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr.Sukhdeep Parmar, DAG, Haryana
for the respondent-State.

Ms.Anu Garg, Advocate
for the complainant.

INDERJIT SINGH, J.

Petitioner has filed this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.145 dated 12.07.2018 under Sections 306 and 34 IPC, registered at Police Station Loharu, District Bhiwani.

Notice of motion was issued. Learned State counsel as well as learned counsel for the complainant appeared and contested the petition.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties 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 got registered by Sandeep, who stated that his brother Pardeep, retired from

Army, lend ₹18,50,000/- to Bhim Singh present petitioner. The complainant further stated that his brother used to tell him and his nephews repeatedly that Bhim Singh is not repaying the money. In this connection, Pardeep has also filed a case at Dadri. The complainant also came to know that his brother had given a sum of ₹1,82,000/- to Dilbag and ₹1,10,000/- to one Naveen. Due to all this, complainant's brother Pardeep left the home. An FIR was got registered regarding his missing. Pardeep committed suicide due to harassment and a suicide note was recovered from the spot. In the suicide note, deceased specifically wrote that he is to get a sum of ₹28,49,000/- from Bhim Singh and he is not paying the same, rather, threatening him. It is also in the suicide note that Bhim Singh is repeatedly saying that he is not going to repay the money and the deceased may do whatever he wants.

The main allegations are levelled against the petitioner. He is specifically named in the suicide note and in the FIR.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case and in view of the serious allegations against the petitioner, nature and gravity of the offence, I do not find it a fit case where petitioner is entitled to benefit of anticipatory bail.

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

October 08, 2018
Vgulati

(INDERJIT SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes
No