

**Sr. No. 218
IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CRM No. M-13095 of 2016 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 05.05.2016

Vikram Singh @ Vicky and another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA

Present:- Mr. Abhishek Sethi, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Mr. Vivek Saini, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Vineet Chaudhary, Advocate,
for the complainant.

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA. J (ORAL)

The present petition has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. seeking concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioners herein in case FIR No.35 dated 12.02.2016, under Sections 148/149/323/324/341/506 of Indian Penal Code and Section 326 (added later on) registered at Police Station Naraingarh, District Ambala.

Counsel for the parties have been heard.

Suffice it to notice that FIR in question came to be registered at the instance of Harpreet Saini in relation to an occurrence that took place on 11.02.2016.

In the occurrence, the complainant Harpreet Saini himself as also Rohit are stated to have suffered two incised injuries each.

There is a specific attribution against petitioner No.1 of having given a *gandasi* blow on the right hand of Harpreet and to

petitioner No.2, namely, Yogesh of also being armed with a *gandasi* and having landed a blow on the back of the head of Harpreet.

These injuries have attracted offence under Section 326 IPC having been declared grievous in nature.

It has been vehemently contended by counsel appearing for the petitioners that it is a case of version and cross-version and even Yogesh i.e. petitioner No.2 herein as also Noor Mohd. had suffered injuries.

It may be noticed that even though the occurrence is stated to be of 11.02.2016 yet DDR pertaining to cross-version was recorded only on 13.02.2016.

State counsel who is on instructions from SI Shyam Lal states that as per doctor's opinion pertaining to injuries suffered by Yogesh and Noor Mohd. it has been opined that such injuries being caused by friendly hand or being self suffered/inflicted cannot be ruled out.

In the light of such specific attribution of injuries to the present petitioners who were armed with sharp edged weapons and having allegedly caused injuries which was opined to be grievous in nature, this Court is not inclined to extend in their favour the concession of anticipatory bail.

Petition is dismissed.

05.05.2016

vandana

**(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE**