

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

**Criminal Misc. No. M- 32822 of 2015
Date of Decision: 24.9.2015**

Sandeep Singh @ Seppa

--Petitioner.

Vs.

State of Punjab

--Respondent.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK

Present : Mr. Sardavinder Goyal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK J. (ORAL)

Petitioner seeks pre-arrest bail in FIR No. 58 dated 31.8.2015 under Sections 307/323/336/506/148/149 IPC and Sections 25/27 of the Arms Act, registered at Police Station Bhadaur District Barnala.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that there was no previous enmity. Petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. Injury attributed to the petitioner has not been found to be grievous or dangerous to health. He further submits that in this view of the matter, offence under Sections 307 IPC would not be made out against the petitioner and he is entitled for the concession of anticipatory bail. He prays for allowing the present petition.

Having heard the learned counsel for the petitioner at considerable length, after careful perusal of the record of the case and giving thoughtful consideration to the contentions raised, this Court is of the considered opinion that in the given fact situation of

the present case, petitioner has not been found entitled for the concession of anticipatory bail. It is so said because petitioner seems to be the main accused. A head injury has been attributed to the petitioner with an iron pipe. Nature of injuries are yet to be ascertained by the doctor, after going through the X-ray report. Allegations being direct and serious, petitioner is not entitled for the concession of anticipatory bail.

In view of the above and without commenting anything further on the merits of the case, at this stage, lest it should prejudice the rights of either of the parties, this Court is of the considered view that in the given fact situation obtaining in the present case, custodial interrogation of the petitioner would be compulsive necessity of the investigating agency, so as to conduct an effective investigation. No case for anticipatory bail has been made out.

Dismissed.

(RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK)
JUDGE

24.9.2015
AK Sharma