



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

103+221

CRM-M-20397-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 08.05.2025

SUNNY KUMAR @ SUNNY MALHOTRA AND ANOTHER

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY

Present : Mr. Ashit Malik, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Jatinder Pal Singh, Sr. DAG Punjab.

SANJIV BERRY, J. (ORAL)

CRM-15792-2025

For the reasons stated in the application, same is allowed.

Annexure P-5 is taken on record subject to all just exceptions.

CRM-M-20397-2025

By way of present petition filed under Section 482 BNSS,
petitioners seek anticipatory bail in case FIR as under:

FIR No.	Dated	Sections	Police Station
40	07.03.2025	108, 61(2) Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023	Moti Nagar, Ludhiana, District Police Commissionerate, Ludhiana

2. It is *inter alia* contended by learned counsel for the petitioners that the petitioners are innocent and have been falsely implicated in this case and have no concern whatsoever with the demise of the deceased nor have



they participated in the same in any manner. He submits that a false case has been concocted to harass the petitioners as the deceased happens to be the father-in-law of the sister of the petitioners. He further submits that the petitioners are having no criminal antecedents and are ready to join the investigation, thus, prayed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

3. *Per contra*, learned State counsel while referring to the status report submitted by State has opposed the petition by arguing that there are specific allegations against the petitioners of having harassed and threatened the deceased on many occasions and even having beaten him. Faced with this harassment, the deceased had consumed poison. He further submits that there is specific video recording of the deceased, wherein he had specifically alleged to be committing suicide being harassed by the petitioners and their sister. Hence, the custodial interrogation of the petitioners is required and prayed for dismissal of the bail petition.

4. Heard.

5. The instant FIR was registered on the allegations of the complainant that her father Inderjit Singh had committed suicide. The daughter-in-law of the deceased, namely Pinki, was married to Jatinder Kumar (son of the deceased and brother of the complainant), who had also expired on 27.06.2023 and the wife of deceased Inderjit had already passed away. It was alleged by the complainant that co-accused Pinki along with her brothers (petitioners herein) were not allowing the deceased to enter his house and he was even beaten up and threatened by the petitioners and the deceased committed suicide by consuming some poisonous substance. The



deceased had left one video-recording wherein he alleged to be committing suicide being fed up with the harassment given by the petitioners and their sister.

6. After considering the arguments and perusing the record, it transpires that specific role is attributed to the petitioners of having abetted the commission of suicide by the deceased, as is evident from the video recording of the deceased.

7. Therefore, considering the serious nature and gravity of offence, it is observed that no case is made out in favour of the petitioner for grant of anticipatory bail, as a consequence, the petition is hereby dismissed.

8. Any observation made above shall not be construed as opinion of this Court on the merits of the case.

(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE

08.05.2025
S.Sharma(syr)

i)	Whether speaking/reasoned?	Yes/No
ii)	Whether reportable?	Yes/No