



CRM-M-65573-2024

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

(101)

CRM-M-65573-2024

Date of Decision:-31.12.2024

Harmanjit

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK JAIN**

\*\*\*\*

Present: Mr. Rajesh Gupta, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Anil Bansal, DAG, Punjab.

\*\*\*\*

**ALOK JAIN, J. (Oral)**

1. The present petition is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.237 dated 29.11.2024, under Sections 108, 61 (2), 3 (5) of the BNS, 2023, registered at Police Station Sadar, Jalandhar.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the FIR had been lodged against six persons and three persons have been duly granted the concession of bail, however, the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Jalandhar, while declining the concession of anticipatory bail to the present petitioner has failed to appreciate that the petitioner was not even named in the FIR and had no role to play.

3. Mr. Gurvinder Arora, Advocate, has put in appearance on behalf of the complainant and filed his vakalatnama, which is taken on



CRM-M-65573-2024

record.

4. Learned State counsel assisted by the counsel for the complainant has vehemently opposed the grant of concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner and submitted that in fact when the anticipatory bail of the ladies of the house was listed and they were granted the interim bail as well, the petitioner threatened them of dire consequences in case the complainant does not withdraw his complaint and qua the same, a DDR was recorded on 17.12.2024. This fact stands duly noticed in the order passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Jalandhar, while granting the concession of bail to the ladies, however, they were granted the concession of bail by returning a finding that it was very improbable that the ladies would exert any such threat, however, since the father of petitioner is Inspector in the Crime Branch, Chandigarh, it could not be ruled out that the petitioner threatened the complainant.

5. Learned counsel for the complainant has also submitted that in fact deceased Raj Kumar committed suicide due to the pressure exerted by the petitioner, co-accused Dharam Pal his father and his sister Manpreet Kaur, who was married to Vikas Singh, son of deceased-Raj Kumar and after getting the permanent residency of Canada, came back to India and started blackmailing and threatening the complainants' family of extortion and involving them in false cases.

6. Heard the learned counsel for the parties at length and considering the fact that the petitioner is the son of the Police Officer and has threatened the complainant for which DDR has been recorded. The



CRM-M-65573-2024

matter needs thorough investigation for which the custodial interrogation of the petitioner would be of extreme importance. As such, this Court does not find any ground to grant the extraordinary concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner which shall affect the proper investigation of the matter.

7. Accordingly the present petition is dismissed.
8. The competent authorities shall also look into the matter and an Officer not below the rank of Deputy Superintendent of Police shall verify the conduct of the Investigating Officer qua the investigation in the present FIR.

**(ALOK JAIN)**  
**JUDGE**

**December 31, 2024.**

*S. Sethi*

Whether speaking/reasoned:- Yes/No  
Whether Reportable:- Yes/No