

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

CRM-M-17938-2019

Date of decision:16.10.2019

Mandeep Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present: Mr. Sukhdeep Singh Sidhu, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Ruchika Sabherwal, AAG, Punjab.

Ms. Iqbal Kaur, Advocate for
Mr. G.S. Sandhu, Advocate
for the complainant.

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner seeks grant of regular bail in respect of FIR No.127 dated 27.5.2018 under sections 306, 34 IPC, Police Station Raman, District Bathinda.
2. The FIR was lodged at the instance of Baljit Kaur wherein it has been alleged that her sister-in-law (*Nanaan*), Paramjit Kaur was married 14 years ago with Mandeep Singh and that they had given sufficient dowry at the time of marriage but the members of her in-laws family were not satisfied with the same and used to demand more dowry. It is further alleged that the petitioner Mandeep Singh, husband of the deceased, Major Singh (father-in-law), Gurdeep Kaur (mother-in-law) and the elder

brother of complainant's husband namely Gulab Singh frequently used to give beatings to the deceased in order to press upon their demands of dowry. It is further alleged that the deceased informed the complainant telephonically on 20.5.2018 that she was fed up and wanted to end her life. Thereafter the complainant received a message that Paramjit Kaur was unwell and admitted in hospital. When the complainant and her husband went to the hospital they came to know that Paramjit Kaur had expired. Upon inquiries having been made by the complainant and others they came to know that Paramjit Kaur being fed up by her husband and in-laws had consumed insecticide (poisonous medicine) and had ended her life.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that it is a case where the deceased Paramjit Kaur was married about 14 years ago to the petitioner and that the deceased used to remain under depression. It has further been submitted that son of the deceased expired in April 2010, who was mentally challenged and that the said death further aggravated the problem of the deceased who was also referred to various Doctors for her treatment. Learned counsel in this regard has referred to medical prescriptions and record pertaining to the deceased annexed as Annexure P-2.
4. Opposing the petition, learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for the complainant has submitted that since categorical allegations have been levelled in the FIR and the petitioner is none-else but husband of the deceased, no case for grant of bail is made out. It has however been

informed that the petitioner has been behind bars since last 16 months and till date only 1 PW out of cited 25 PWs has been examined.

5. I have considered rival contentions addressed before this Court. It will not be appropriate for this Court to make any expression as regards the contentions of the petitioner that the deceased was a patient of Schizophrenia and mental depression. However the fact remains that despite the petitioner having been behind bars for the last 16 months only 1 PW out of cited 25 PWs has been examined. In these circumstances further detention of the petitioner would not serve any useful purpose. The petition, as such, is accepted and it is ordered that petitioner be released on bail on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

(GURVINDER SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

16.10.2019
Gaurav Sorot

Whether reasoned / speaking? **Yes / No**

Whether reportable? **Yes / No**