

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-52087-2018

Date of Decision: 21.01.2019

Kulwinder Singh

.... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.... Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMENDRA JAIN**

Present: - Mr. KP Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Harpreet Multani, AAG, Punjab.

Ms. GK Mann, Advocate for the complainant.

**RAMENDRA JAIN, J. (ORAL)**

Through this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C., prayer has been made for grant of anticipatory bail to petitioner, in case FIR No. 32 dated 26.03.2018 registered under Sections 302, 148 and 149 IPC at Police Station Lopoke, District Amritsar (Rural).

According to the prosecution, the petitioner along with his accomplice, namely; Lakhbir Singh @ Lakha, Dalip Singh, Raju Singh @ Raju, Manga Singh and Ranjit Singh @ Labha etc., committed the murder of Mangal Singh son of complainant-Surjit Kaur, on 20.08.2016.

Learned counsel *inter alia* contends that the petitioner has been named after 1½ years of the death of Mangal Singh. As per initial version of the complainant, her son had died due to drowning, but after 1½ years, the complainant came up with new story, naming the petitioner and his accomplice as killers of her aforesaid son, on the basis of last

seen evidence as per statement of her Jeth, namely; Mukha Singh.

On the other hand, learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for the complainant vehemently opposing the submissions of learned counsel for the petitioner urged that even the regular bail application of co-accused, namely; Daleep Singh, was dismissed as withdrawn, vide order dated 11.07.2018, of this Court passed in CRM-M-22176-2018. The petitioner with the help of his companions had murdered a young un-married boy aged around 20 years. Therefore, he does not deserve concession of anticipatory bail. His custodial interrogation is very much necessary to interrogate him qua the mode and motive for committing murder of Mangal Singh, aforesaid.

Considering the seriousness of allegations levelled against the petitioner and the fact that the petitioner along with his companions murdered a young un-married boy aged around 20 years, he does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail.

The instant petition being meritless is dismissed.

**January 21, 2019**

*rishu*

**(RAMENDRA JAIN)  
JUDGE**

**Whether speaking/reasoned**

**Yes/No**

**Whether Reportable**

**Yes/No**