

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

**CRM-M-33606-2021(O&M)**

Date of Decision: 30.9.2021

Baljinder Singh @ Balwinder Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ**

Present: Mr. Gurdas Singh, Advocate, for the petitioner.

**Rajesh Bhardwaj, J. (ORAL)**

Matter has been taken up through video conferencing via Webex facility in the light of the Pandemic Covid-19 situation and as per instructions.

Prayer in the present petition is for grant of anticipatory to the petitioner in case FIR No.202 dated 16.6.2021 under Sections 363 and 366-A IPC registered Police Station Sadar Dabwali, District Sirsa in which during investigation offence under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B IPC were added later on.

Vide order dated 27.7.2021, the petition for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner was ordered to be dismissed as withdrawn. This is the second petition for the same relief.

As per the factual matrix of the case, the FIR was lodged by the mother of the victim, wherein it was alleged that her daughter, who is 17 years of age, has been enticed away by Raju son of Lal Chand on 15.6.2021. Request was made to take legal action against the culprit. The petitioner approached the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sirsa for grant of anticipatory bail, which was declined vide order dated 13.7.2021.

Thereafter, the petitioner approached this Court by filing the petition, which was ordered to be dismissed as withdrawn. Now the petitioner again approached this Court by filing the present petition.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He submits that he has not been named in the FIR and hence, no case for custodial interrogation is made out against the petitioner and the petitioner be enlarged on anticipatory bail.

Heard.

It is evident from the facts of the case that the victim is minor and during the investigation, it has been found that the complainant, co-accused and the petitioner belong to the same i.e. village Lakhuana. The victim was minor, whereas the allegations are that her date of birth was forged. The petitioner was a witness to the marriage of the victim. For unravelling the truth and allegations in the case, a free and fair investigation is essential. The victim in the case is minor and hence, this Court finds no change of circumstances which existed on 27.7.2021, when the first petition of the petitioner for grant of anticipatory bail was rejected.

In view of the same, the present petition being devoid of any merits is hereby dismissed.

**(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)**  
**JUDGE**

**30.9.2021**  
sharmila

|                           |   |        |
|---------------------------|---|--------|
| Whether Speaking/Reasoned | : | Yes/No |
| Whether Reportable        | : | Yes/No |