



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

216

I.

CRM-M-21554-2024

Gurdhiyan Singh

.....Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

II.

CRM-M-25501-2024

Nirmal Singh

.....Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

Date of Decision.:27.05.2024

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK GUPTA

Present:- Mr. Luvinder Sofat, Advocate and
Mr. Arjun Kapoor, Advocate for
the petitioner(s).

Mr. Sahil R. Bakshi, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Simrandeep S. Sandhu, Advocate
for the complainant.

DEEPAK GUPTA, J. (ORAL)

In the two petitions titled above, both filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C., petitioners pray for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.52 dated 04.04.2024 under Sections 306 & 34 of the IPC registered at Police Station Samana, District Patiala.

2. Manpreet Singh son of Gurjit Singh committed suicide on 31.03.2024. FIR was lodged by Gurjit Singh, the father of the deceased

CRM-M-21554-2024

2024:PHHC:075646



CRM-M-25501-2024

2024:PHHC:075649



stating therein that his son Manpreet (deceased) had been entrapped by Bhinder Kaur wife of Rajvir Singh of the village and both of them had eloped from the village on 18.02.2024. After about one month they returned to the village. A Panchayat was held and Rajvir Singh, the husband of Bhinder Kaur along with Nirmal Singh (*petitioner in CRM-M-25501-2024*) and Gurdhiyan Singh (*petitioner in CRM-M-21554-2024*) demanded an amount of ₹10,00,000/- from the deceased, son of complainant. On account of fear, they compromised the matter for an amount of ₹2,00,000/-. It was alleged further that even after that compromise, the above-named person i.e. the petitioners and Rajvir Singh kept on harassing the complainant and his son for extracting more money. On 30.03.2024, it was disclosed to the complainant by Gurdeep Singh, who had received a mobile call from petitioner Gurdhiyan Singh to the effect that the accused were again leveling false allegations to the effect that deceased had provided a cell phone to Bhinder Kaur. It is alleged that accused including the two petitioners had threatened Manpreet Singh to get him jailed for 20 years and that they will not let him live in the village. He was further threatened that he and his family shall be insulted in the village. After hurling these threats they went away. In the afternoon of the next day, Manpreet committed suicide because of the aforesaid threats and harassment.

3. It is contended by learned counsel that petitioners have been falsely implicated; that in fact the dispute emanated on account of the illicit relationship of deceased with Bhinder Kaur; that ingredients of abetment of suicide under Section 306 IPC read with Section 107 IPC are not made out;

CRM-M-21554-2024

2024:PHHC:075646



CRM-M-25501-2024

2024:PHHC:075649



that deceased committed suicide when the illicit relationship brought significant shame to him in the society; and that no overt act has been attributed to any of the petitioners.

4. Learned State counsel along with counsel for the complainant strongly opposed the petitions by submitting that petitioners are specifically named in the FIR. They are specifically attributed to have harassed the petitioner by threatening him, which caused abetment to such an extent that he took the extreme step of taking his own life and that in these circumstances, petitions do not deserve to be given the benefit of anticipatory bail.

5. After hearing both the sides and looking into the facts and circumstances of the case and the gravity of the offence, but without commenting anything further on the merits of the case, this Court is not inclined to grant the benefit of anticipatory bail to any of the petitioners. Both of them are specifically named in the FIR to have threatened the deceased even one day prior to the incident of committing suicide.

Dismissed.

A photocopy of this order be placed on the connected case file.

(DEEPAK GUPTA)
JUDGE

May 27, 2024
Neetika Tuteja

Whether Speaking/reasoned Yes/No
Whether Reportable Yes/No