

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

(1) CRM No.M-41628 of 2016 (O&M)

Manjeet Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

(2) CRM No.M-41659 of 2016 (O&M)

Rimpy

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

Date of Decision: December 16, 2016

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

Present: Mr.Narinder S. Lucky, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr.P.S.Grewal, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab
for the respondent-State.

INDERJIT SINGH, J.

Petitioners have filed these petitions under Section 438 Cr.P.C.
for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.14 dated 26.01.2016 under
Sections 308, 323, 341, 427, 148 149 IPC (later on Sections 307, 324, 325
and 326 IPC were added), registered at Police Station Mehatpur, District
Jalandhar.

Notice of motion was issued and learned State counsel appeared and contested the petitions.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioners as well as learned State counsel and have gone through the record.

From the record, I find that petitioner Rimpay was named in the FIR and stated to be armed with *kirpan*, though no specific injury has been attributed to him. But when the statement of the injured was recorded, specific injuries were attributed to Rimpay. Similarly, petitioner Manjeet Singh, though not named in the FIR but injury with iron rod blow on the ankle of the injured has been attributed to him in the statement of the injured. The injured received so many injuries including fractures on the legs and arms etc.

Keeping in view the nature and gravity of the offence and the injuries attributed to both these petitioners by the injured, I do not find it a fit case where petitioners are entitled to benefit of anticipatory bail.

Therefore, finding no merit in both the petitions, the same are dismissed.

December 16, 2016
Vgulati

(INDERJIT SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes
No