

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

**CRM-M No. 39146 of 2020
Date of decision: 19.01.2021.**

Sukhwinder Singh

..... Petitioner.

Versus

State of Punjab and another

..... Respondents.

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL

Present:- Mr. C.M. Munjal, Advocate, for the petitioner.

ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL, J. (ORAL)

Heard through video conferencing.

The petitioner has challenged the order dated 27.10.2020 passed by the Additional Sessions Judge, Sri Muktsar Sahib, whereby respondent No. 2 has been granted anticipatory bail.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the deceased had named respondent No. 2 in his suicide note and, therefore, he could not have been granted anticipatory bail.

Heard.

FIR had been registered by the petitioner under Section 306 and 506 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, on the allegations that his father, who was working as Lineman, was suspended on 24.09.2020, due to which he was under great mental stress and suffering from depression. The father of the petitioner had approached respondent No. 2, who was his immediate boss, for his reinstatement, but he had allegedly demanded bribe

which had upset the father of the petitioner and he had committed suicide. Respondent No. 2 had been granted anticipatory bail by the Additional Sessions Judge, Sri Muktsar Sahib, wherein it is noticed that the deceased had been suspended by the order passed by the Executive Engineer, who is the competent authority to order suspension or reinstatement. Respondent No. 2 was working as Sub Divisional Officer. It has also been noticed that the authenticity of the suicide note is yet to be determined.

Therefore, I do not find any illegality in the impugned order granting anticipatory bail to respondent No. 2.

Consequently, the petition stands dismissed.

(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

19.01.2021
Ramesh

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No