

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh

.....

Criminal Misc. No.M-23229 of 2015

.....

Date of decision:17.9.2015

Ladda

...Petitioner

v.

State of Punjab

...Respondent

....

Coram: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Inderjit Singh

.....

Present: Mr. D.S. Kahlon, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. B.S. Bhullar, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab
for the respondent-State.

Mr. A.P.S. Randhawa, Advocate for the complainant/
injured.

.....

Inderjit Singh, J.

The petitioner has filed this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C.
for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.60 dated 30.4.2015 registered
for the offences under Sections 307, 323, 324, 382, 148 and 149 IPC at
Police Station 'C' Division Amritsar, District Amritsar.

Notice of motion has been issued in this case. Mr. B.S. Bhullar,
learned Assistant Advocate General, Punjab has put in appearance on behalf
of the respondent-State and Mr. A.P.S. Randhawa, learned Advocate has
appeared on behalf of the complainant/injured and contested this petition.

Police record is also available.

[2]

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

As per the prosecution version, the FIR was registered on the statement of complainant-Satish Malhotra alias Bittu. The present petitioner is named in the FIR. He was armed with a 'Gandasi'. Specific injury is also attributed to him which he had given with 'Gandasi' on the back of the complainant.

Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that the petitioner has not given any injury to Avinash Malhotra, who had suffered injury dangerous to life. This is no ground for grant of anticipatory bail. Specific injury has been attributed which he had given to complainant-Satish Malhotra. The injury dangerous to life has been given to Avinash Malhotra by the co-accused. A perusal of the record shows that the present petitioner has played active role in the commission of the offence. He is required for custodial interrogation. Weapon is to be recovered from him. Otherwise also, keeping in view the nature and gravity of the offences, I do not find it a fit case where the petitioner is entitled to the benefit of anticipatory bail.

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

September 17, 2015.

(Inderjit Singh)
Judge

hsp