

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

**CRM-M No.13749 of 2021  
Date of Decision:05.04.2021**

**JASPAL SINGH**

**...Petitioner**

**Versus**

**STATE OF PUNJAB**

**...Respondent**

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

Present: Mr. Kulwinder Singh Rathour, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. P.S. Walia, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Kuldeep V. Singh Ahluwalia, Advocate  
for the complainant.

\*\*\*\*

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

Through this second petition, the petitioner seeks regular bail in case bearing FIR No.24 dated 03.03.2019 registered at Police Station Division No.4, Jalandhar, under Sections 376, 506 and 120-B IPC (however charge-sheeted under Section 354-C IPC vide order dated 14.12.2020 passed by the learned trial Court while deciding the application under Section 216 Cr.P.C) .

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case. In fact, the complainant and her uncle are the landlords of the petitioner and there was a dispute between

them. Moreover, the complainant, while appearing into the witness-box, has not supported the prosecution version. It is also argued that the earlier petition filed by the petitioner for regular bail, was dismissed as withdrawn for the reason that during the pendency of the same, charge under Section 354-C IPC was framed by the trial Court. The petitioner has been in custody since 03.03.2019.

While opposing the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, learned State counsel assisted by the learned counsel for the complainant, draws the attention of this Court towards the testimony of the complainant recorded before the trial Court on 19.11.2019, specifically supporting the prosecution version. It is further contended that that out of 13 prosecution witnessed, 02 have been examined.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

Specific allegations have been levelled by the complainant against the petitioner in her statements recorded under Sections 161 and 164 Cr.P.C. The complicity of the petitioner and his wife, has been alleged in the FIR and the manner of commission of the crime, also stands clearly described in the version contained in the FIR. The allegations being serious in nature, the petitioner is not entitled to the grant of bail.

In view of the above, the present petition is dismissed.

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL )  
JUDGE

April 05, 2021

*Jyoti-IT* Whether speaking/reasoned Yes/No Whether Reportable Yes/No