

CRM-M-23784-2021

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

CRM-M-23784-2021

Date of decision: 24.06.2021

Gurmeet Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Raghav Goyal Chandiwalla, 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.58 dated 22.03.2021, registered Police Station Civil Lines, Batala, District Gurdaspur, under Sections 363, 363-A, 366-A, 376 and 511 IPC and Section 8 of the POCSO Act.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the above-noted FIR was registered against some unknown person and the petitioner was not named in the FIR, but has falsely been implicated due to political motives. Moreover, a compromise has been effected between the petitioner and the complainant, father of the victim, vide compromise deed dated 01.05.2021 (Annexure P-2). In such circumstances, learned counsel prays that the petitioner may be granted the concession of anticipatory bail.

I have heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and gone through the record.

The allegations against the petitioner are of kidnapping the prosecutrix, stated to be of 14-year-old, and also committing rape upon her.

CRM-M-23784-2021

The plea of learned counsel for the petitioner that the matter has been compromised between the petitioner and father of the prosecutrix, is inconceivable keeping in view the allegations contained in the FIR coupled with the fact that the investigation is at the initial stage. Moreover, a crime against the women and children, being heinous and gruesome, as it not only takes away from them their dignity, but scars their body and soul for all time to come, is a crime against the society as a whole.

The allegations against the petitioner are very serious in nature and in case, he is granted the benefit of anticipatory bail, every effort may be made by him to either tamper with the evidence or win over the witnesses.

In view of the above, I find that the petitioner is required for custodial interrogation.

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

24.06.2021

parveen kumar

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?

Yes/No

Whether reportable?

Yes/No