

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

**CRM-M-26153-2020 (O&M)**

**Date of decision: 04.09.2020**

Parmjit Singh and another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL**

Present:- Mr. Gurmeet Singh, Advocate for the petitioners.

\*\*\*\*

**HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)**

Case is taken up for hearing through video conferencing.

Through the instant petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C., the petitioners seek anticipatory bail in case FIR No. 115 dated 13.08.2020 registered under Section 306 read with Section 34 IPC, at Police Station Haryana, District Hoshiarpur.

Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that the husband of the complainant was working as a travel agent. He was a habitual offender and because of the said fact many criminal cases had been registered against him. It is further submitted that as a matter of fact in the year 2011, the complainant and her late husband had taken an amount of Rs. 4 lacs from petitioner No. 2 for sending his son abroad but neither his son was sent abroad nor the money was returned. When petitioner No. 2 and one Jaswinder Singh had submitted a complaint to the police in this regard, the husband of the complainant was called in the police station, but he could not prove his innocence. It is further submitted that as the husband of the complainant had been under a huge debt, he committed suicide on account of

the mental stress. It is, thus, contended that by lodging the present FIR, the complainant is trying to kill two birds with one stone i.e. firstly, falsely implicating the present petitioners so as to compel them not to demand their money back and secondly absolving herself of any liability to return the amount.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of this Court, Mr. Ajay Pal Singh Gill, DAG Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State.

At this stage, Mr. Kartik Gupta, Advocate, appears for the complainant.

Learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for the complainant submits that in this case the deceased husband of the complainant has left a suicide note specifically naming the petitioners being responsible for his death. Thus, they vehemently oppose the prayer for anticipatory bail.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

It is a case, where the deceased husband of the complainant has left behind a suicide note. He has specifically named the petitioners and one Jaswinder Singh, being responsible for his death as the said persons were allegedly making false complaints against the deceased regarding sending the people abroad. The allegations levelled against the petitioners are serious and, thus, they do not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail.

Dismissed.

**(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)**  
**JUDGE**

**04.09.2020**

*Mangal Singh*

Whether reasoned/speaking?  
Whether reportable?

Yes/No  
Yes/No