

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

CRM-M-37306-2016 (O & M)

Date of decision: December 16, 2016

Deepak Sheoran

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

Present: Mr. Jitender Dhanda, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vikramjit Singh, Addl. A. G. Haryana.

Mr. Kuldeep Khandelwal, Advocate for
Mr. Rajesh Khandelwal, Advocate,
for the complainant.

INDERJIT SINGH, J.

Petitioner, Deepak Sheoran has filed this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.636 dated 22.09.2016, registered at Police Station Civil Lines Hisar, under Sections 323, 341 and 506 IPC and Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959.

Notice of motion was issued in this case.

Learned State counsel has put in appearance on behalf of the respondent-State and the complainant also appeared through his counsel. They contested this petition.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner; learned State counsel as well as learned counsel for complainant and have gone through the record.

From the record, I find that as per the prosecution version, the present petitioner who is working with the complainant in the office of Assistant Registrar, was armed with pistol. He caused simple injuries to the complainant and also abused him. He also threatened the complainant at the point of pistol under the influence of liquor. The petitioner is a colleague of the complainant.

I have gone through the statements of co-employees available on the police file which have been recorded by the investigating officer. As per police file, even the inquiry got conducted by the officer has gone against the present petitioner.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case and in view of the fact that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required as weapon is yet to be recovered and in view of the conduct of the present petitioner in his office with his colleagues, I do not find it a fit case where the petitioner is entitled to the benefit of anticipatory bail.

Therefore, finding no merit in the present petition, the same is dismissed.

December 16, 2016

parveen kumar

(INDERJIT SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes
Whether Reportable	:	No