

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

CRM-M-31582-2020
Date of decision: 09.10.2020

Vijay Verma

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

Present:- Mr. Namit Khurana, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sumit Jain, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

Mr. B. S. Khehar, Advocate
for the complainant.

(Through Video Conferencing)

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J. (Oral)

The petitioner prays for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No. 150 dated 16.09.2020, registered under Sections 306 and 34 of the IPC at Police Station Buria, District Yamuna Nagar.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that as per the allegations in the FIR, registered at the instance of complainant Anuj Kumar, it is stated that his brother Deepak @ Sanju (deceased) was married and was having two children. Deepak came in contact with one Sarita and later on, Sarita, in conspiracy with petitioner Vijay Verma, Sonu Verma and Sachin (brothers of Sarita), started blackmailing him and threatening to

implicate him in a false case of rape. Due to this, Deepak was under pressure and ultimately he committed suicide by jumping into Yamuna river on 13.09.2020. His dead body was recovered on 15.09.2020. A video clip in the mobile phone of Deepak was found, which he recorded immediately before committing suicide and the same was handed over to police.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that deceased Deepak was a drunkard person and he concealed his marital status from Sarita while developing relation and on coming to know this fact, Sarita refused to maintain the relation with him.

It is further submitted that Sarita is employed as a Nurse in Kapil Hospital, Jagadhri and on 11.09.2020, Deepak came to hospital and compelled her to sit in a car, which is recorded in CCTV camera.

Learned counsel further submits that petitioner has falsely been implicated in this case and he has no role in the life of Sarita and deceased Deepak.

Learned State counsel, assisted by learned counsel for the complainant, opposes the bail on the ground that petitioner has active role in abetting the deceased to commit suicide.

Learned counsel for the complainant has referred to a conversation (Annexure P-2), relied upon by the petitioner, which was between the wife of Deepak, namely Reena, and petitioner, in which petitioner is seen having each and every knowledge about deceased and aforesaid Sarita. In this conversation, it has also come that Sarita was blackmailing deceased Deepak and was extracting money from him. In this conversation, the petitioner has even advised Reena that he knew a DSP in

Women Police Station and if she approaches him, he can get the matter resolved. The conversation further shows that petitioner had every knowledge about the day to day life of deceased Deepak and it appears that even the petitioner is interested in co-accused Sarita.

At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner, finding that the Court is not convinced, seeks withdrawal of the petition.

Dismissed as withdrawn.

09.10.2020
Waseem Ansari

(ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No