



CRM-M-27161-2025

-1-

205

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

CRM-M-27161-2025

Date of Decision:- 02.07.2025

ASHISH KUMAR ALIAS CHINTU

...Petitioner

Vs.

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE AMARJOT BHATTI

Present:- Mr. Jashan Mehta, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Japjot Singh, AAG, Punjab.

AMARJOT BHATTI, J.

1. Petitioner has filed instant petition under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.74 dated 16.04.2025 under Sections 108 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 registered at Police Station Kotwali, Patiala.

2. As per facts of the case, complainant gave her statement that she is doing the business of giving performance in the weddings etc. Her younger sister Sehreen @ Mahi aged about 23 years i.e. victim was residing near her house on rent along with her friend Swati for the last about 2 months. On 10.04.2025, she left the house by taking away her mobile phone No.79863-86567 and did not return home. She along with her husband Sonu lodged missing report on 12.04.2025. About 2 years ago, she was being harassed by Ashish Kumar @ Chintu who was married man having children.



He insisted her to remain in touch with him and was not permitting her sister to marry anybody else. He used to call her on mobile phone repeatedly. Her sister wanted to marry Salman son of Yameen but he was restraining the victim from marrying him by giving threats to kill her. On 10.04.2025, Sehreen had spoken on phone No.78270-29293 of some girl Jasmeen. On enquiry complainant came to know that said phone calls were of Chintu. Because of this, her sister has committed suicide by jumping into canal.

3. Learned counsel for petitioner argued that allegations levelled against petitioner are false. Even as per the facts narrated in the FIR, it is claimed that Asheesh Kumar @ Chintu was in contact with deceased victim two years ago. Thereafter, he never came in contact with the alleged victim. Petitioner is married man. He is falsely implicated in this case. He is ready to join the investigation. Therefore, his anticipatory bail application may be allowed.

4. Bail application is opposed by learned counsel representing State. Facts are confirmed in the status report. As per the post-mortem report, cause of death is 'Asphyxia due to Antemortem drowning, which is sufficient to cause death in ordinary course of nature, however, viscera is being sent for chemical analysis'. Petitioner is specifically named. Allegations are serious. His custodial interrogation is required. Therefore, he is not entitled to the relief of anticipatory bail.

5. I have considered the facts and the arguments advanced by learned counsel representing petitioner as well as learned State counsel. It is a case of unnatural death of the victim. It is alleged that petitioner came into



contact with victim about 2 years ago and she was being harassed by petitioner. The victim was not permitted to settle down in her life, as a result victim took this grave step. There is also reference of calls between petitioner and the deceased victim. Investigation is at initial stage. Mobile phone and call detail record are yet to be checked by Investigating Agency. Considering the facts of the case and its gravity, I do not find a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner and his anticipatory bail application is, accordingly, declined.

6. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, stand disposed of accordingly as well.

(AMARJOT BHATTI)
JUDGE

02.07.2025

snd

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No.

Whether reportable : Yes/No