

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

(I)

CRM-M-12021-2020

DEEPA RAM @ DEEP SINGH

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

(II)

CRM-M-12094-2020

SATVINDER KAUR @ BINDU AND ANR

....Petitioners

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

....Respondent

Date of Decision:20.5.2020

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present: Mr. Parminder Singh Sekhon, Advocate
for the petitioners in CRM-M-12021-2020.

Mr. Jagmeet Singh Moudgill, Advocate
for the petitioners in CRM-M-12094-2020.

Mr. Sandeep Vermani, Addl. A.G. Punjab.

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

1. This order shall dispose of the aforementioned two petitions filed on
behalf of petitioners-Deepa Ram @ Deepa Singh and Satvinder Kaur

seeking anticipatory bail in respect of case registered against them vide FIR No.24 dated 8.3.2020 under Sections 306/34 IPC at Police Station Bathinda, District Bathinda.

2. The FIR in question was lodged at the instance of Pardeep Kumar wherein it has been alleged that on 7.3.2020 (his cousin brother) Ravi Kumar committed suicide by jumping in front of a train and that he came to know about the same after reading about it in the newspaper. The complainant identified the dead body of Ravi Kumar. It is alleged that house of Parshotam Singh was in the same street where the house of Ravi Kumar was situated and that Parshotam Singh had installed CCTV cameras in his house and the direction of the said CCTV camera was towards the house of Ravi Kumar to which Ravi Kumar had been objecting. There had been a fight amongst them on the said issue which was later compromised in the Police Station and Parshotam Singh had assured that he would change the direction of the camera but despite said assurance he did not change the directions. It is alleged that Parshotam Singh however challenged Ravi Kumar that he may do whatever he likes and he being Reader of SSP will not change the direction of cameras. It is further alleged therein that subsequently ASI Deep Singh posted at Police Station City-II Mansa used to issue threats which Ravi Kumar used to discuss at his home. It is alleged that on 7.3.2020, Ravi Kumar committed suicide while leaving a suicide note alleging that Purshotam Singh and his family had been harassing him and his mother and that he had earlier also tried to commit suicide but then matter was compromised and despite the same Purshotam Singh and his wife Bindu kept on

threatening him and that due to fear of Purshotam Singh, he committed suicide.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners have submitted that they have falsely been implicated in the present case and that entire allegations as per FIR are against Purshotam Singh. It has further been submitted that even as per suicide note (Annexure P-4) in *Punjabi*, no specific role is attributed either to ASI Deep Singh or to Bindu wife of Purshotam Singh and that in these circumstances aforesaid petitioners deserve the concession of bail.
4. Opposing the petitions, the learned State counsel has submitted that since both the petitioners are specifically named in the FIR, no special case for grant of anticipatory bail is made out. It has however been informed that pursuant to interim direction issued on 7.5.2020 in CRM-M-12021, the petitioner-Deep Ram @ Deep Singh had joined investigation.
5. I have considered rival submissions addressed before this Court. As far as the petitioner-Deepa Ram @ Deep Singh is concerned, a perusal of the FIR would show that there are general allegations qua him inasmuch as it is stated in the concluding part of FIR that he had also issued threats to Ravi Kumar regarding which Ravi Kumar had discussed at his home. However, there is nothing to show that the complainant was present when said threats were issued or whether Ravi Kumar had disclosed about said threats at any point of time to complainant. The main allegations as per FIR and suicide note are against Purshotam Singh whose bail application has been dismissed *in limine* vide order dated 11.5.2020 passed in CRM-M-12094-2020. In these circumstances, when the allegations against

petitioner Deepa Ram are general in nature and no motive is attributed to Deepa Ram, and even in suicide note the only reference qua him are that he had made a telephone call to deceased, in my opinion, the concession of anticipatory bail can be extended to him.

6. As far as petitioner-Satvinder Kaur @ Bindu is concerned, there are vague allegations in the FIR in the concluding part to the effect that she along with Purshotam Singh was responsible for the death of Ravi Kumar. Similar is the position in suicide note. In these circumstances and while bearing in mind that petitioner-Satvinder Kaur @ Bindu is a lady and has joined investigation and while bearing in mind that no specific role is attributed to her, she can also be extended the benefit of anticipatory bail.
7. In view of the aforesaid discussion, both the applications merit acceptance and are hereby accepted. The interim directions issued vide order dated 7.5.2020 passed in CRM-M-12021-2020 are made absolute subject to the condition that the petitioner-Deepa Ram @ Deep Singh 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.. It is also ordered that in the event of arrest of petitioner-Satvinder Kaur @ Bindu she shall be released on bail subject to her furnishing personal bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of Arresting/Investigating Officer. However, the petitioner shall join the investigation as and when called upon to do so and cooperate with the Arresting/Investigating Officer and shall also abide by the conditions as provided under Section 438 (2) Cr.P.C.

8. It is, however, clarified that none of the observations made above shall be construed to be an expression on merits of the main case.

20.5.2020
Gaurav Sorot

(GURVINDER SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned / speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes / No
Yes / No