

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

1. CRM-M-49831-2019

Harmeet Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

2. CRM-M-50769-2019

Gagandeep Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

Reserved on : 02.12.2019
Pronounced on : 03.12.2019

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

Present:- Mr. Ajay Sangroha, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-m-49831-2019.

Ms. Ekta Thakur, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-50769-2019.

Mr. Joginder Pal Ratra, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Sarju Puri, Advocate
for the complainant in both cases.

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J. (Oral)

This common order shall dispose of above noted two petitions as
they arise out of the same FIR.

These petitions have been filed under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure for grant of anticipatory bail to petitioners in FIR No. 386 dated 23.10.2019, registered under Section 306 IPC at Police Station Division No. 5, District Ludhiana.

As per the allegations in the FIR, registered on the statement of complainant Rajinderpal Singh, it is stated that he is a retired person having two sons. His younger son Gurdeep Singh @ Kau was a law graduate and was residing at Ludhiana along with his family as he was working as a legal advisor with Sri Ram Finance Company, Ludhiana. It is further stated that for the last one month, he was not attending the phone as he was in stress and when the complainant asked him the reason, he informed him that his seniors Inderdeep Singh along with his friends are humiliating him in the office and they are defaming him and even they are giving adverse reports with their seniors and in that process, he was dismissed from service by the company. It is further stated that even the complainant tried to make his son understand and reconcile the situation, however, on 23.10.2019, the grand-daughter and grandson of the complainant had gone to school and his son had gone to drop his wife, who was working in State Bank of India, and after dropping her at the bank, he came back after 10-15 minutes. At that time, the complainant and his wife were sitting in the courtyard and Gurdeep Singh went upstairs where he committed suicide by hanging himself in the store. Thereafter, Jimmy, neighbour of the complainant, informed about the incident and when the complainant went upstairs, he found that Gurdeep Singh has committed suicide and he has left a suicide note, in which, he levelled allegations against Inderdeep Singh and petitioners herein. It is further stated in the suicide note that these persons have hacked his phone and are projecting the deceased as a

rapist in the office and before the colleagues and feeling harassed and humiliated, he has committed suicide.

Learned counsel for petitioner Harmeet Singh has argued that he was posted in the other wing of the company and, therefore, he was not directly attached with the wing where deceased was working. It is also argued that petitioner Harmeet Singh was not having any direct interaction with the deceased, therefore, there was no occasion for him to abet Gurdeep Singh to commit suicide.

Learned counsel for petitioner Gagandeep Singh has argued that there was no friendship or relation between the petitioner and deceased and, therefore, there is remote possibility of his involvement in the case.

It is also submitted that petitioner was working as Technical Manager, whereas the deceased was a legal advisor, therefore, there was no connection between them and even the deceased has himself left his job.

In reply, learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Judge Singh, assisted by learned counsel for the complainant, has, however, opposed the prayer of the petitioners.

Learned counsel for the complainant has argued that there are direct allegations against the petitioners as per the suicide note recovered.

Learned counsel for the complainant has further argued that the allegations are such that the deceased was humiliated continuously for a long time by the accused persons.

After hearing learned counsel for the parties, I do not find any ground to grant concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioners considering the serious allegations against them, who were named in the suicide note by the deceased.

Accordingly, these petitions are hereby dismissed.

A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of other connected case.

03.12.2019

Waseem Ansari

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

(ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN)
JUDGE

Yes/No
Yes/No