

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

**Criminal Misc. No. M-23574 of 2015
Date of Decision:-22.7.2015**

Vikram Kumar

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARI PAL VERMA

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

Present:- Mr. N.K. Ganga, Advocate
for the petitioner.

HARI PAL VERMA J.(Oral)

Prayer in this petition is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.86 dated 6.5.2015, under Sections 148, 149, 323, 506 and 427 IPC (Section 307 IPC added later on), registered at Police Station Ding, District Sirsa.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the name of the petitioner has unnecessarily been dragged, even though he was not present at the spot.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and peruse the FIR as well as the order passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sirsa dated 15.7.2015.

In the present case, the FIR was registered on the basis of statement of Bansi Lal, who was Manager at Khatu Shyam Petrol Pump, National Highway No.9, Sirsa to the effect that on 5.5.2015 at about 9.30

PM he himself, his brother Satyanarayan and salesman Mithu were sitting on the western side of their petrol pump when the accused, who were moving in a car stopped there and have gone back. However, after 20 minutes the same car again came to the machine at the petrol pump and suddenly the car struck with the complainant, who was sitting on the petrol pump injuring the complainant, his brother Satyanarayan and the salesman Mithu. In this manner, the accused persons brutally injured the complainant. When Satnarayan tried to catch hold the car driver, one person gave a kapa blow on the head of Mithu, whereas another person has given an iron rod blow on the head of Satyanarayan, whereas, the third person gave kappa blow on the head of Satyanarayan. During the course of investigation, the accused were arrested and in the disclosure statement name of the petitioner figured as main accused, at whose instance the occurrence had taken place. There is reference of some other case pending against the petitioner under Sections 147, 149, 332, 353 and 186 IPC. Therefore, the petitioner does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail.

Dismissed.

It is made clear that any expression made herein above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case and the trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available evidence.

July 22, 2015
Vijay Asija

(HARI PAL VERMA)
JUDGE