

Sr. No.221

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM No.M-18621 of 2016 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 01.06.2016

Vijay Kumar

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

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

Present:- Mr. Shiv Charan Bhola, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. K.D.Sachdeva, Additional A.G., Punjab.

Mr. Tejinder Pal Singh, 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 petitioner in case FIR No.39 dated 13.02.2016, under Sections 307,324, 323, 148, 149 of Indian Penal Code, registered at Police Station City Sangrur, District Sangrur.

Even though it is the contention raised by counsel that it is a case of version and cross-version and it is yet to be determined as to which is the aggressor party yet as per version contained in the FIR, the present petitioner is stated to have been armed with a *gandasi* and has inflicted two blows which landed on the head of Vijay Kumar son of Jangir Ram. That apart, even Dharma son of Juma Sansi co-accused was stated to be armed with a *kirpan* and he has also inflicted *kirpan* blows on the head of Vijay Kumar Son of Jangir Ram. The version of the complainant/injured Vijay Kumar finds corroboration in the medical examination and in the MLR, the

following five injuries have been noticed on the head of Vijay Kumar son of Jangir Ram:-

1. 3 cm x .5 cm incised wound over parietal left region. Advise xrays CT scan and surgical opinion.
2. L shaped lacerated wound 3 cm x .5 cm and 2 cm x .5cm adjoining injury No.4. Advise xrays CT scan and surgical opinion.
3. Lacerated wound L shaped 3 cm x .5 cm, 2cm x .5 cm over right parietal occipital region. Advise xrays CT scan and surgical opinion.
4. Lacerated wound 2 cm x 1 cm over occipital promineral. Advise xrays CT scan and surgical opinion.
5. Abrasion with swelling behind right pinna. Advise xrays, ENT opinion and surgeon opinion.

Such assault and causing of injuries has even attracted offence under Section 307 IPC.

In view of the specific allegations levelled against the petitioner and coupled with the gravity of the offence, this Court is not inclined to extend in favour of the petitioner the concession of pre-arrest bail.

Petition dismissed.

01.06.2016

vandana

**(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE**