

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

**CRM-M No. 27909 of 2020
Date of decision: 15.09.2020.**

Pardeep Kumar Sharma

..... Petitioner.

Versus

State of Punjab and others

..... Respondents.

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL

Present:- Mr. Sanjeev Kumar Bawa, Advocate, for the petitioner.

ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL, J. (ORAL)

Heard through video conferencing.

The petitioner has challenged the order dated 27.07.2020 (Annexure P7) whereby anticipatory bail to respondents No. 2 and 3 has been confirmed.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that although it has been recorded by the trial Court that respondents No. 2 and 3 were not cooperating with the investigation, but without assigning any reasons the anticipatory bail granted to them has been confirmed.

Heard.

The FIR has been lodged by the petitioner, who is the father of the daughter-in-law of respondents No. 2 and 3. Respondents No. 2 and 3 are stated to be over 66 years of age. I have perused the FIR. The allegations against respondents No. 2 and 3 are vague and general in nature. Therefore, I do not find any good ground to cancel the anticipatory bail granted to respondents No. 2 and 3.

Consequently, the petition stands dismissed.

At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner contends that there is a reasonable apprehension that respondents No. 2 and 3 might leave the country and the petitioner has preferred an application (Annexure P8) before the trial Court in this regard, but the same has not been decided.

The trial Court is directed to consider and decide the application (Annexure P8) expeditiously.

(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

15.09.2020
Ramesh

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No