

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

CRM-M-24092 of 2016

Date of Decision: 25 July, 2016

Nachattar Singh @ Raju

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE FATEH DEEP SINGH

Present: Mr. Jetinder Pal Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Gurveer Sidhu AAG (Pb.) for State.

FATEH DEEP SINGH, J.

The petitioner Nachattar Singh @ Raju has sought anticipatory bail under Section 438 Cr.P.C.. The brief allegations are that on account of selling of house by the family of the complainant Sukhdip Singh to the accused, the accused had undertaken to pay the amount by 30.04.2016. The accused had taken the possession of the house but failed to pay the amount and as a consequence of which on 6.5.2016 when injured complainant Sukhdeep Singh and his father-injured Hardeep Singh asked for the money accused alleged to have taken out his gun and gave one shot hitting left thigh of Hardeep Singh and second fire hitting the complainant a little above the knee. The leg of the father of the complainant Hardeep Singh was amputated as a result of this.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has sought to argue

that it is the complainant side which has sought to trespass into the house purchased by the accused and that it was more of by way of action taken in self defence as the complainant side were trying to forcibly dispossess the petitioner from the house in question.

The learned State counsel has opposed the bail on the grounds that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is essential as well as recovery of the weapon of the offence is yet to be made. The prima facie allegations against the petitioner, whereby, he has given two fire shots from his gun hitting the complainant-son and the father, latter having been crippled for life on account of amputation of his leg, together with the fact that recovery of the firearm is yet to be made, Thus, the petitioner who is evading his arrest needs to be interrogated and the investigations are at very crucial stage.

In view of the same and keeping in view the seriousness of the allegations no ground to grant concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner is made out.

Dismissed.

(FATEH DEEP SINGH)
JUDGE

July 25, 2016
aarti