IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

208

CRM-M No.30685 of 2023 (O&M)
DATE OF DECISION: 06th SEPTEMBER, 2023

Ranjha

…. Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

…. Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJBIR SEHRAWAT

Present : Mr. Yaseen Sethi, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Jaspal Singh Guru, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Rakesh Kumar, Advocate
for the complainant.

* * * *

RAJBIR SEHRAWAT, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, praying for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.0047 dated 27.03.2023, registered under Sections 364, 342, 323, 506 of the Indian Penal Code but later on Sections 364 and 342 IPC has been deleted and Sections 344, 346, 367 and 374 IPC has been added) at Police Station Adampur, District Jalandhar Rural.

2. It is submitted by counsel for the petitioner that case against the petitioner is totally false and concocted. The petitioner has not done anything illegal and he had not detained anybody against their will at his premises. The allegation against the petitioner has been levelled for

SANDEEP GROVER
2023.09.06 17:01
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this order/judgment.

political reasons by the Panches of the village. Even the allegations qua getting forcible work and even giving beatings to the alleged detenues are totally wrong. No objection had ever been raised by any one of the alleged detenue earlier in this regard. Hence, the petitioner deserves to be protected against his arrest.

3. Counsel for the State, on instructions from ASI Gurmeet Singh, has submitted that the petitioner was keeping some bonded labourers and had illegally confined them at his premises. The police had received a complaint from the public representatives of the area, including the panches of the village. On the information, the police had conducted raid at the premises of the petitioner. Two persons were got released by the police from there. After having been released, the said detenues have made a specific statement that they were forcibly confined by the petitioner at his premises, he was given beatings and was exploited. Hence, the petitioner does not deserve any concession of anticipatory bail. To unearth the true dimensions of the crime, involving the petitioner in such activities, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required.

4. In view of the above submissions of the counsel for the State, this Court does not find it appropriate to grant concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, at this stage.

5. Dismissed.

06th SEPTEMBER, 2023 **(RAJBIR SEHRAWAT)**
'sandeep' **JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes* *No*

Whether Reportable: *Yes* *No*

SANDEEP GROVER
2023.09.06 17:01
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this order/judgment.