

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

-.-

Crl. Misc. No. M 17 of 2015

Date of decision: 12.01.2015

*Bikramjit Singh and others*

*..... Petitioners*

*Versus*

*State of Punjab*

*.....Respondent*

**Coram: Hon'ble Mrs. Justice Rekha Mittal**

-.-

Present: Mr. Rishu Mahajan, Advocate  
for the petitioners

Mr. Gazi Mohammad, DAG, Punjab

-.-

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

**Rekha Mittal, J. (Oral)**

The petitioners pray for grant of bail in anticipation of arrest in FIR No. 106 dated 22.07.2014 under Section 326, 323 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code (in short, IPC) registered in Police Station Majitha, Amritsar.

Counsel for the petitioners contends that with regard to the alleged occurrence dated 17.06.2014, the medico legal examination was conducted on 20.06.2014. It is further submitted that injuries found on the person of Kartar Singh are self inflicted or result of friendly hand in order to indict the petitioners and co-accused Jagtar Singh in criminal case as there is a property dispute between Jagtar Singh and Kartar Singh, the real

brothers. It is further argued that the injury constituting offence under Section 326 IPC has been attributed to petitioner No. 2 Ranjit Singh and injuries attributed to petitioner No. 1 Bikramjit Singh are simple in nature. It is further submitted that the petitioners are ready to join investigation and cooperate throughout.

Counsel for the State has seriously opposed the prayer for bail with the submissions that the injured victim was admitted in the hospital on 17.06.2014 but his medico legal examination was conducted on 20.06.2014 when he was lying admitted in the hospital. It is further argued that the victim in his statement, basis of the FIR, has attributed specific role to each of the petitioners who attacked him and caused injuries reflected in his MLR.

I have heard counsel for the parties and perused the records.

Keeping in view the role attributed to each of the petitioners and co-accused Jagtar Singh in view of statement of the injured victim coupled with the injuries reflected in the MLR of the injured victim and fact that weapons of offence are yet to be recovered, custodial interrogation of the petitioners is required which disentitles them to concession of bail in anticipation of arrest.

Dismissed.

(Rekha Mittal)  
Judge

12.01.2015  
mohan