

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-38638-2019

Date of decision : 18.10.2019

Satish Kumar

.... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present: Mr. Harsh Garg, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Ruchika Sabharwal, AAG, Punjab.

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J (ORAL)

1. The petitioner has approached this Court seeking grant of anticipatory bail in a case registered against him vide FIR No.123 dated 19.5.2019 under Sections 306/120-B IPC at Police Station Jamalpur, District Ludhiana.
2. The FIR was registered at the instance of Jaswant Singh wherein it has been alleged that his younger daughter Jatinder Kaur @ Jyoti was married to Raj Kumar in the year 2014. However, her in-laws started harassing and beating her just about six months after their marriage regarding which his daughter had informed them several times. She had informed that her mother-in-law Parveen Kaur, sister-in-law ('*nanand*') Amandeep Kaur and husband of sister-in-law ('*nandoia*') Ranjit Singh and maternal uncle of her husband namely Satish Kumar used to abuse her and gave beating to her. It is alleged that once Jatinder Kaur's mother-in-law namely Parveen Kaur threw hot milk upon Jatinder Kaur resulting in burn injuries regarding which a compromise was entered

with her daughter's inlaws who gave assurance that such thing would not happen in future. It is alleged that on 19.5.2019, the complainant's daughter called him over phone and disclosed that Parveen Kaur, Amandeep Kaur, Ranjit Singh and Satish Kumar were abusing and harassing her and asked the complainant to take her from her matrimonial home and upon which the complainant asked her to come by bus, in case she has bus fare. Later, Jatinder Kaur called the complainant and told him that inlaws were not allowing her to come out and that she is going to commit suicide, being fed up with them. It is alleged that later the complainant received a call from her daughter's neighbourhood that she has died. It is further the case of prosecution that complainant's daughter was found dead due to hanging.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that he has falsely been implicated in the present case merely being '*nandoia*' of deceased i.e. husband of sister of complainant's husband.
4. Opposing the petition, the learned State counsel has submitted that since the petitioner is specifically named in the FIR, no case for grant of anticipatory bail is made out. It has further been informed that during the course of investigation, statements of some independent witnesses have been recorded who had overheard the petitioner fighting with the deceased. A prayer has, thus, been made to dismissal of the petition
5. I have considered rival submissions addressed before this Court. The petitioner is not only specifically named in the FIR but specific role has also been attributed to him, which has been found to be *prima facie* substantiated from the statements of some witnesses recorded in terms of

Section 161 Cr.P.C.. During the course of investigation, the police has recorded statements of two of the neighbours of the deceased, namely, Amrik Singh and Nirmaljit Kaur, who have both stated that on 19.05.2019, they had heard the accused quarrelling with the deceased. They have categorically stated regarding the presence of the petitioner-Satish in the matrimonial home of the deceased on 19.05.2019 when the quarrel had taken place. In these circumstances, this Court does not find any special case for grant of anticipatory bail.

6. The petition is sans merit and is hereby dismissed.

(GURVINDER SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

18.10.2019

Dinesh

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether Reportable : Yes/No