

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh

.....

Criminal Misc. No.M-20722 of 2016

.....

Date of decision:12.7.2016

Satbir and another

...Petitioners

v.

State of Haryana

...Respondent

....

Coram: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Inderjit Singh

.....

Present: Mr. U.K. Agnihotri, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. D.S. Virk, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana
for the respondent-State.

Mr. J.S. Mor, Advocate for the complainant.

.....

Inderjit Singh, J.

The petitioners have filed this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.106 dated 3.5.2016 registered for the offences under Sections 302, 323, 148, 149 and 120-B IPC at Police Station Uchana, District Jind.

Notice of motion has been issued in this case.

Mr. D.S. Virk, learned Assistant Advocate General, Haryana has put in appearance on behalf of the respondent-State and Mr. J.S. Mor, learned Advocate has appeared for the complainant and contested this petition. Police record is also available.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned

[2]

Deputy Advocate General, Haryana appearing for the respondent-State and learned counsel for the complainant and have gone through the record.

From the record, I find that firstly the petitioners are named in the FIR. They were stated to be armed with Lathi each. Satbir and others also caused injuries from their respective weapons to Vikram, Satish and Guddi. Due to injuries Dalbir died.

Keeping in view the nature and gravity of the offences and further that the petitioners were named in the FIR, they were armed with Lathis and actively participated in the commission of the offences, they also caused injuries, due to which one person died and three persons received the injuries, the counsel for the complainant as well as learned State counsel state that there is also a CD of the occurrence in which the petitioners were also present, they are required for their custodial interrogation. Therefore, in view of the nature and gravity of the offences, I do not find it a fit case where the present petitioners are entitled to the benefit of anticipatory bail.

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

July 12, 2016.

(Inderjit Singh)
Judge

hsp