

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh

.....

Criminal Misc. No.M-3534 of 2019

Date of decision:07.02.2019

Tarlok Singh

...Petitioner

v.

State of Punjab

...Respondent

....

Coram: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Inderjit Singh

.....

Present: Mr. Rajiv Mittal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Dhruv Dayal, Senior Deputy Advocate General, Punjab
for the respondent-State.

.....

Inderjit Singh, J.

The petitioner has filed this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C.
for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.214 dated 14.12.2017 for the
offences under Sections 306 and 120-B IPC at Police Station Sadar,
Samana, District Patiala.

Notice of motion was issued in this case.

Mr. Dhruv Dayal, learned Senior Deputy Advocate General,
Punjab has appeared on behalf of the respondent-State and have gone
through the record.

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 in the the FIR as well as in the

[2]

suicide note the present petitioner has been named. As per the suicide note, the petitioner along with others have levelled false allegations against the deceased and also gave threatening to kill him from the last night of that day.

Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that petitioner is entitled for the benefit of anticipatory bail on the ground of parity with Gurnam Singh. I have gone through the record. Gurnam Singh is not named in the suicide note nor any specific allegation has been levelled in the suicide note against him that is why he has been granted the benefit of anticipatory bail, whereas the present petitioner is named in the FIR as well as in the suicide note and specific allegations have been levelled against him. Therefore, there is no question of parity.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case and the fact that the petitioner is named in the FIR as well as in the suicide note and specific allegations have been levelled against him, I do not find it a fit case where the petitioner is entitled for the grant of anticipatory bail.

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

February 07, 2019.

(Inderjit Singh)
Judge

hsp

NOTE:	Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes
	Whether reportable:	No