

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

208

CRM-M-26649 of 2019 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 04.10.2019

Surender @ Sunder

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present:- Mr. J.S. Ghuman, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. Neeraj Poswal, AAG, Haryana

Amol Rattan Singh, J. (Oral)

Pursuant to the order of this court dated 11.09.2019, learned State counsel submits that he has been instructed by Sh. Rajesh Kumar, Deputy Commissioner of Police, Manesar, that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is very much required, in view of the fact that the petitioner has been named as the person with whom the sale proceeds of a plot were deposited.

Though learned counsel for the petitioner has very vehemently argued that the entire allegation in the suicide note is against one Hari, yet looking at the fact that the petitioner is also stated to have taken the entire amount of money for a plot sold by the deceased to one Nisha, and he has been named as such in the suicide note, with investigation also having been conducted to the effect that upon the sale consideration having been deposited in the deceaseds' account it was withdrawn on the next date by the deceased, the opinion of the investigating agency also being that it was given to the petitioner, without making any comment on the actual merits of

the case, for or against the petitioner, this petition is dismissed, with the interim order vacated.

Learned counsel for the petitioner in fact now again reiterates what he has submitted on the initial date of hearing, to the effect that the petitioner has been named in the FIR only because he is a witness to a deed by which 38 kanals of land were transferred from the name of the deceased to the mother of the deceased, and therefore the wife of the deceased has a grievance against the petitioner.

Even having considered that, on the strength of which the petitioner had been admitted to interim bail by this court, the fact remains that the petitioner has been named in the suicide note itself, stated to have been written by the deceased (with that note having been sent for forensic examination) and consequently, in view of what has been observed herein above, the petitioner would not be entitled to anticipatory bail at least, in my opinion.

04.10.2019
vcgarg

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking: Yes
Whether reportable: No