

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

CRM-M-16852-2021

Date of Decision: 22.04.2021

Joginder

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present: Mr. D.R.Bansal, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J.(Oral)

Case is taken up for hearing through video conferencing.

Through this petition, the petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No.45 dated 18.03.2021, registered at Police Station Phillukhera, District Jind, under Sections 15(2), 15(3) of the Indian Medical Council Act, Sections 3, 4 and 5 of the Medical Termination of Pregnancy Act, and Section 120-B IPC.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case; that in the FIR, there is no allegation regarding his involvement in the crime; that he is not running any Yash Diagnostic Center, at Safidon and that he has no concern with Dr. Monika Sharma.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of this Court, Mr. Pardeep Prakash Chahar, DAG, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State, and submits that the petitioner had supplied strips containing five tablets to Mukesh through her brother Dilbag and after consuming the said tablets,

the abortion had taken place. Even as per the call details, the petitioner was regularly in contact with the other co-accused.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

As per the prosecution version, the petitioner, who is running Yash Diagnostic Centre, Safidon, took Mukesh wife of Devender, who was three months' pregnant, on 17.03.2021, to the hospital of Dr. Monika Sharma, Radhe Krishna Nursing Home, Safidon, for abortion and thereafter, he had supplied strips containing five tablets to Mukesh through her brother Dilbag for Rs.450/-, and that after consuming the said tablets, the abortion took place.

Keeping in view the serious allegations against the petitioner that he has actively participated in getting the foetus aborted by Mukesh coupled with the nature and gravity of the offence, this Court finds that the petitioner is required for custodial interrogation.

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

22.04.2021

parveen kumar

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

Note:	Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
	Whether reportable	:	Yes/No