

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-43745-2019 (O&M)
Date of decision: 12.12.2019

Ramdita Singh

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

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

Mr. Joginder Pal Ratra, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Amardeep Singh Mann, Advocate
for the complainant.

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J. (ORAL)

Prayer in this petition is for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.0080 dated 10.09.2019 under Sections 306/34 IPC, registered at Police Station Ghagga, District Patiala.

While granting interim bail to the petitioner, following order was passed by this Court on 14.11.2019: -

“Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that as per the allegations in the FIR, registered on the statement of complainant Teja Singh, it is stated that wife of the petitioner was having some relation with deceased Sinda Singh @ Ganji and on that account, on 01.09.2019, the petitioner along with his brother Gurpreet

Singh and father Arjan Singh gave beatings to him.

Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that it is the further allegations in the FIR that later on, Sinda Singh @ Ganji committed suicide by jumping into the water of Bakhra Dam.

Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the complainant never approached the police on 01.09.2019 and till the date when the dead body was recovered on 10.09.2019, no complaint was lodged with the police.

Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that with regard to alleged injuries attributed to petitioner and two aforesaid co-accused in the incident occurred on 01.09.2019, no MLR was conducted of the injured and even no suicide note was recovered after the death of Sinda Singh @ Ganji.

It is further submitted that there is a gap of ten days from the date when the deceased was allegedly beaten on 01.09.2019 till the date when he committed suicide i.e. 10.09.2019, therefore, it will be a debatable issue whether the petitioner acted in a manner which abetted the deceased to commit suicide.

Learned counsel for the complainant has opposed the prayer of the petitioner, however, he could not dispute the fact that in between 01.09.2019 and 10.09.2019, no complaint was lodged with the police and no MLR was conducted.”

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in pursuance of the aforesaid order, the petitioner has joined the investigation and is not required

for any further investigation.

Learned State counsel, assisted by learned counsel for the complainant and on instructions from ASI Lali Ram, has not disputed the factual position and states that the petitioner is no more required for any further investigation.

In view of the above, this petition is allowed and the interim bail granted to the petitioner vide order dated 14.11.2019 is made absolute subject to the conditions envisaged under Section 438 (2) Cr.P.C.

[ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN]
JUDGE

12.12.2019
vishnu

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether Reportable : Yes/No