

103

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

CRM-M-38199-2021

Date of Decision: September 15, 2021

Ritesh Kumar

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr.Pankaj Bali, Advocate
for the petitioner.

.....

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J.

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

Instant petition has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. praying for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.372, dated 18.08.2021, under Section 306 IPC, registered at Police Station Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra.

The present FIR has been recorded on the statement of Mahender Singh on the basis of the allegations that his son Sandeep Kumar is living in abroad whereas his daughter-in-law, Amarjeet Kaur, alongwith her children is residing with him. It was alleged that the petitioner, Ritesh Rohilla, alongwith his friend Anshul alias Deepanshu Sharma used to trouble his grand-daughter, who is 15 years of age. He made his efforts to bring in knowledge the same to the parents of the petitioner, however, the matter was not reported to the police. He had alleged that his daughter-in-

his friend, finally committed suicide on 15.08.2021. On the basis of the FIR it was prayed that action be taken against the culprits. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely roped in the FIR and no offence, as such, is made out. He further submits that petitioner is a young boy and thus, deserves the concession of anticipatory bail.

Heard.

The petitioner earlier has approached learned Additional Sessions Judge, Kurukshetra for grant of anticipatory bail, who after hearing, declined the same.

It is also apposite to note that the petitioner is accused in another case, i.e. FIR No.250, dated 16.08.2021, under Sections 8, 12 of POCSO Act, registered at Police Station City Thanesar, Kurukshetra, wherein also the petitioner is alleged to have committed the offence against the daughter of the deceased.

In overall facts and circumstances of the case when weighed on the anvil of parameters laid under Section 438 Cr.P.C., I find that the petitioner does not qualify for the concession of anticipatory bail. His custodial interrogation is required in the present case. The petition devoid of any merits, is hereby, dismissed.

September 15, 2021
meenuss

(**RAJESH BHARDWAJ**)
JUDGE

1. **Whether speaking/reasoned ?**
2. **Whether reportable ?**

Yes/No
Yes/No