

CRM-M-31524-2020

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-31524-2020

Date of decision:22.12.2020

Krishan Kumar

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Chander Pal Tiwana, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ashok Singh Chaudhary, Addl. A. G. Haryana.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

Case is taken up for hearing through video conferencing.

Through this petition, the petitioner seeks regular bail in case bearing FIR No.551 dated 27.12.2019, registered at Police Station Pundri, District Kaithal, under Sections 302, 201, 120-B and 34 IPC.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner was not named in the FIR, and that the above-noted FIR was registered on the complaint of one Suresh Kumar, who is owner of the fields where the dead body of Neelam had been found. He further contends that there are two contradictory disclosure statements of the petitioner allegedly recorded by the police during investigation. In his first statement dated 01.01.2020, he stated that he had strangled his wife with the help of a *shawl*, whereas in the second statement recorded after the receipt of opinion given by the doctors of PGI, Rohtak, he stated that he had inflicted injury upon his wife with the help of a sharp-edged sugarcane, which is the cause of death of the

CRM-M-31524-2020

deceased as per the medical opinion. The petitioner has been in custody since 31.12.2019.

On the other hand, learned State counsel points out that in his disclosure statement, the petitioner confessed that he had murdered his wife. He also admitted that he had illicit relations with Manjit wife of Chander Bhan and due to this reason, he had committed the murder of his wife.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

There are serious allegations against the petitioner that he had committed the murder of his wife. The learned Additional Sessions Judge, Special Court, Kaithal, while dismissing the bail application of the petitioner, has rightly noticed that there is no reason to falsely implicate the petitioner, especially when there is no explanation on his behalf that how his wife had been brutally killed.

Keeping in view the nature and gravity of the offence, but without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, this court finds that the petitioner is not entitled to the benefit of regular bail. Even otherwise, if the petitioner is enlarged on bail at this stage, he may influence the prosecution witnesses.

Therefore, finding no merit in the present petition, the same is dismissed.

22.12.2020

parveen kumar

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No