

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh

.....

Criminal Misc. No.M-1562 of 2015

.....

Date of decision:16.1.2015

Manpreet Singh and another

...Petitioners

v.

State of Punjab

...Respondent

....

Coram: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Inderjit Singh

.....

Present: Mr. R.S. Rai, Senior Advocate with Mr. Karan Pathak,
Advocate for the petitioners.

.....

Inderjit Singh, J.

This petition has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for the grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.111 dated 2.9.2014 registered at Police Station Payal, Police District Khanna, District Ludhiana for the offences under Sections 307, 336, 427, 506, 182, 193, 211, 34 and 120-B IPC and Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act (offences under Sections 182, 211 and 193 IPC were added subsequently).

I have heard learned senior counsel for the petitioners and have gone through the record.

From the record, I find that as per the prosecution version, FIR was got registered by Rajwinder Singh for the offences under Sections 307, 336, 427, 506, 182, 193, 211, 34 and 120-B IPC and

[2]

Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act by alleging false version that he along with his friend Manpreet Singh were going to Village and one Safari car of white colour, which was being driven by Simranjit Singh Dhindsa along with Satwinder Singh alias Sani Shekhon, Amritpal Singh alias Lavi Walia, Ramanpreet Singh Randhawa, Jasvir Singh Fauji and two other unidentified youths, who were sitting on the back seats and holding naked swords, tried to stop their vehicle. The above stated persons were having gun etc. and they gave threats and abused the complainant. Amritpal Singh alias Lavi fired a gun shot in the air from his rifle. Satwinder Singh had fired in the running vehicle which hit the other side of the driver and passed therefrom. During investigation, this version was found false. Statement of Manpreet Singh was recorded under Section 161 Cr.P.C. and this FIR was registered. The present petitioners Manpreet Singh and Gagandeep Singh are the eye witnesses of that case.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, nature and gravity of the offences and as the petitioners have been named in the version and active role has been attributed to them, I find that they are required for custodial interrogation. Therefore, no case is made out for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

Therefore, finding no merit in this petition, the same is dismissed.

January 16, 2015.

(Inderjit Singh)
Judge

hsp