

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

CRM-M-15583-2020

Date of decision: 14.7.2020

JAGDISH SINGH

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present: Mr. Monty Goyal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Harbir Sandhu, AAG, Punjab.

*(the aforesaid presence is being recorded through video
conferencing since the proceedings are being conducted in Virtual
Court)*

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner has filed this petition seeking grant of regular bail in a case registered against him vide FIR No.67 dated 23.5.2019 under Sections 304-B/34 IPC at Police Station Doraha, District Khanna.
2. The FIR was registered at the instance of Sukhdev Singh wherein it has been alleged that marriage of his daughter Sukhpreet Kaur was solemnized in December, 2017. However, shortly after marriage of her daughter, her in-laws started demanding dowry but the complainant could not accede to their demands. It is alleged that complainant's daughter used to be harassed by Sukhdeep Singh (son-in-law); Paramjit Kaur (mother-in-law); Babbu, brother-in-law (*Jaith*) and Sarabjit Singh (father-in-law) of complainant's daughter in order to press upon demand of

dowry. The complainant's daughter used to remain mentally upset on account of said demand. It is alleged that on the night of 21.5.2019 the father-in-law of complainant's daughter told the complainant telephonically that complainant's daughter Sukhpreet was admitted in Sidhu Hospital, Doraha being unwell and that Sidhu Hospital had referred her to CMC, Ludhiana. Later, when the complainant went to CMC Hospital his daughter expired and it is alleged that the accused had administered some poison to the complainant's daughter.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that he has falsely been implicated in the present case merely on account of fact that he happens to be brother of complainant's son-in-law. It has further been submitted that even as per the FIR vague allegations have levelled against all members of the in-laws family of deceased and that there is no specific allegations against the petitioner.
4. Opposing the petition, learned State counsel has submitted that since the petitioner has specifically named in the FIR and has also alleged to have join hands with the remaining members of the family of son-in-law of the complainant in harassing the deceased, no case for grant of bail is made out. Learned State counsel has however informed that the petitioner has been behind bars since last more than 6 months and that '*Challan*' stands presented and that till date one out of cited 12 PWs has been examined.
5. I have considered rival submissions addressed before this Court.
6. Keeping in view the fact that the petitioner happens to be brother-in-law of the deceased and that he has already been behind bars since last more

than 6 months, further detention of the petitioner will not serve any useful purpose as conclusion of trial is likely to take some time.

7. The petition, as such, is accepted and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned.

14.7.2020
Gaurav Sorot

(GURVINDER SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

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

Whether reportable? **Yes / No**