

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

CRM-M-38891-2019
Date of decision:16.12.2019

SATNAM SINGH

....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present: Mr. Hoshiar Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Rashmi Attri, AAG, Punjab.

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner seeks grant of anticipatory bail in respect of FIR No.167 dated 29.8.2019 registered under Sections 354, 341 IPC, Police Station, Guru Harsahai, District Ferozepur.
2. The FIR was lodged at the instance of victim wherein it has been alleged that on 29.8.2019 when she was going along with her husband on a bullet motorcycle then Satnam Singh, Om Parkash and Falak Singh came in front of their motorcycle and blocked their way. It is alleged that Falak Singh raised a '*Lalkara*' exhorting his companions not to spare the complainant and her husband and upon which Satnam Singh (petitioner), Falak Singh and Om Parkash removed the '*Dupatta*' worn by the

complainant. It is alleged that while Om Parkash kept on blocking their way, Satnam Singh and Falak Singh held the complainant from her hands and threw her on the ground and also touched her breasts in order to outrage her modesty. It is further alleged that aforesaid accused insulted the complainant and also scuffled with her husband Charanjit Singh. It is further alleged therein that when subsequently, when complainant's father-in-law and some other persons were attracted to the spot, accused ran away from the spot. The motive attributed for the occurrence is that there is a dispute in respect of a passage near the house of the complainant regarding which the matter is pending in the Courts at Guru Harsahai.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner and other accused have falsely been implicated in the present case simply to pressurize them on account of civil suit which is pending in the Courts at Guru Harsahai with regard to a dispute of passage near the house of the complainant.
4. Opposing the petition, learned State counsel has submitted that since there are specific and categorical allegations levelled against the petitioner, no case for grant of anticipatory bail is made out. It has however been informed that pursuant to interim directions issued by this Court, the petitioner has joined investigation.
5. Without expressing anything as regards merits of the case and while bearing in mind that the petitioner has already joined investigation and nothing is to be recovered from him, in my opinion, it is not a case which

would warrant custodial interrogation. Accordingly the petition is accepted and the interim directions issued vide dated 12.9.2019 by this Court are hereby made absolute subject to the condition that the petitioner would appear before Investigating Officer as and when called upon to do so and cooperate with the Investigating Officer and shall also abide by the conditions as provided under Section 438 (2) Cr.P.C.

(GURVINDER SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

16.12.2019
Gaurav Sorot

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

Whether reportable? **Yes / No**