



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

CRM-M-35142-2024
Decided on : 03.12.2024

Gurmeet Singh @ Gurmeet Singh Sandhar Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present : Mr. G.S.Khokhar, Advocate
 for the petitioner.

Mr. Navdeep Singh, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Lupil Gupta, Advocate
for the complainant.

Manjari Nehru Kaul, J.

The present petition has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C., for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.84 dated 13.06.2024 under Sections 306, 34 IPC registered at Police Station Talwandi Sabo, District Bathinda.

2. On 16.09.2024, while noticing the following submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, this Court had granted the concession of interim bail to the petitioner and asked him to join investigation:

“Learned counsel for the petitioner inter alia contends that the complainant (father of the deceased) while lodging the FIR in question (Annexure P-1) had clearly come out with a fabricated version, which is evident from the fact that the suicide note left



behind by the deceased was contrary to the allegations levelled in the FIR. While drawing the attention of this Court to the suicide note (Annexure P-3) it has been argued that the deceased had mentioned that he was leading a good life with his wife Sukhpreet Kaur and two children; however, suddenly one night the petitioner was called by his wife to meet her; when the deceased tried to switch on the light, his wife caught hold of him, as a result of which, the petitioner succeeded in running away; even though he was unsuccessfully chased by the deceased. It has been submitted that firstly, the essential ingredients to attract the mischief of an offence under Section 306 IPC are absent in the present case and furthermore, the complainant came up with an entirely embroidered version, which is evident from the fact that in the FIR, he had alleged that his daughter-in-law had been in an illicit relationship with the petitioner since long and thereafter she had left her matrimonial home as all efforts to counsel her prove to be in vain. It has been further argued that even assuming for the sake of arguments though not conceded that as per the suicide note left behind by the deceased, the petitioner was seen running away from his house, it cannot be said to be such a compelling circumstance so as to drive the deceased to suicide.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance of order dated 16.09.2024, petitioner has joined the investigation and cooperated with the investigating officer.
4. Learned State counsel, on instructions, has not disputed the submission made by learned counsel for the petitioner. Learned State counsel has further submitted that the petitioner is not required for custodial interrogation.
5. Learned counsel for the complainant has, however,



opposed the prayer made by the counsel opposite by submitting that a suicide note has been left behind by the deceased, which left no manner of doubt that the petitioner had abated his suicide.

6. In view of the above, present petition is allowed and interim order dated 16.09.2024 is made absolute subject to the conditions as envisaged in Section 438(2) Cr.PC/482(2) of BNSS.

03.12.2024
sonia

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether reportable :	Yes/No