

**In The High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana
At Chandigarh**

CRM-M-34497-2020 (O&M)

Date of Decision:- 6.11.2020

Suraj Kumar

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Manish Mehta, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Karan Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

(Proceedings conducted through video conferencing)

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner seeks grant of anticipatory bail in respect of a case registered against him vide FIR No.519, dated 18.9.2020, Police Station City, Narnaul, under Section 306, 34 IPC.
2. The FIR in question was lodged at the instance of Vinod Kumar wherein it is alleged that his sister Sunil @ Bintu was married to Suraj (petitioner) 22 years ago, but since the last about 4-5 years Suraj was having illicit relations with a lady namely Maya who lives

in his farmhouse. It is alleged that Suraj used to harass the complainant's sister for the last 3-4 years and used to threaten to divorce her. It is alleged that although the complainant and other members of family had tried to reason out, but to no avail. It is alleged that on 17.9.2020 Suraj, his mother Chanda, Murari Lal (father of Suraj) and Maya had together killed complainant's sister or had compelled her to end her life.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that he has falsely been implicated in the present case and that there is no credible evidence to suggest that the complainant's sister had been driven to commit suicide by any act or conduct of the petitioner. Learned counsel for the petitioner has further submitted that since it is a case where the marriage had taken place in the year 1994, it cannot be expected that the deceased after such a long period of her marriage would commit suicide on account of conduct of her husband.
4. Opposing the petition, the learned State counsel has submitted that since there are direct allegations against the petitioner that he apart from maintaining illicit relations had been threatening to divorce the deceased, no case for grant of bail is made out.
5. I have considered rival submissions addressed before this Court. Keeping in view the fact that the petitioner was having illicit relations and in fact had been threatening his wife to divorce her, it could be said to be sufficient reason to abet the deceased to take the drastic step of ending her life especially when the said Mistress Maya

was stated to be residing at the farmhouse of the petitioner. In these circumstances, this Court does not find any special case to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. The petition is sans any merit and is hereby dismissed.

November 6, 2020

mohan

**(GURVINDER SINGH GILL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking /reasoned

Yes / No

Whether Reportable

Yes / No