



101+222/2

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

**CRM-M-20549-2025
Date of decision:-20.05.2025**

TARSEM SINGH

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

... Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY.

Present:- Mr. Rajesh Bhatheja, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. K.D. Sachdeva, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. A.S. Ahluwalia, Advocate,

Mr. G.K.Ahluwalia, Advocate

Ms. Sunidhi Jain, Advocate

Mr. Ashok Kumar, Advocate for the complainant.

SANJIV BERRY, J. (ORAL)

CRM-20304-2025

The instant petition has been preferred under Section 582 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for adding Section 107 of BNS in the main petition which is added later on vide GD No. 26, dated 07.05.2025 (Annexure P-9).

2. Heard.

3. The application is allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

Registry to do the necessary amendments.



Main case.

1. Learned State counsel has filed reply by way of an affidavit dated 15.05.2025 of Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub-Division Sri Muktsar Sahib, the same is taken on record, copy thereof has been supplied to the counsel opposite.

2. The instant petition has been preferred by the petitioner under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail in the following case (Annexure P-1):-

FIR No.	Dated	Sections	Police Station
18	17.03.2025	108 of BNS	Bariwala, District Sri Muktsar Sahib

3. Arguments heard.

4. It is *inter alia* contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in this case. He contends that petitioner has no concern with the demise of the deceased and the deceased has named the petitioner just to harass him on account of money transactions, infact the petitioner had executed the agreement to sell (Annexure P-2) selling the land of the deceased and there is no question of the petitioner being instrumental in the demise of the deceased arise at all. He submits that the petitioner is not having any criminal antecedent and is ready to join the investigation. He contends that co-accused Suba Singh has already been granted concession of anticipatory bail on 29.03.2025 (Annexure P-3). Hence prayed for grant of concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. *Per contra*, learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel



for the complainant, referring to the reply submitted by the State have opposed the bail petition of the petitioner by submitting that the deceased Gurlal Singh had categorically named the petitioner and other co-accused in his last video recorded just prior to his committing suicide alleging the accused harassing him, resulting in his committing suicide alongwith minor son. They contend that the facts of the co-accused Subha Singh are distinguishable as he was not named in the last video of the deceased, whereas the petitioner has categorically been named as instrumental in harassment. Hence prayed for dismissal of the bail petition.

6. After considering the rival contentions and perusing the record, it is observed that the instant FIR was registered on the statement of complainant Karanveer Kaur that the petitioner alongwith other accused were to get back some amount from her father-in-law Jagroop Singh who had returned the amount after selling his land but despite that the accused persons had not returned the promisory notes and after the death of father-in-law of the complainant, they were harassing her husband Gurlal Singh by demanding money from him and also resorted to abusive language by visiting their house and fedup with this, her husband Gurlal Singh committed suicide with their minor son Baljodh Singh. The deceased Gurlal Singh had made a video recording before committing suicide wherein he had named the petitioner and other co-accused to be responsible for their death.

7. It is evident from the perusal of record that in the last video recording of the deceased he has specifically named the present petitioner alongwith other co-accused to be instrumental in the committing of suicide



by the deceased Gurlal Singh and his son, being fedup with the harassment given by the petitioner and other co-accused. Therefore, considering the serious nature and gravity of the offence, 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.

9. Pending application(s) if any shall also stand disposed of.

(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE

20.05.2025

Gyan

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