

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

CRM-M No.41000 of 2015 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 07.01.2016

Veer Vikram @ Sagar

..... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASWANT SINGH

Present: Mr. Surinder Singh Siao, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Mikhail Kad, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab
for the respondent/State assisted by S.I. Swaran Singh.

JASWANT SINGH, J. (Oral)

The prayer is for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.227 dated 12.11.2015, under Sections 323, 324, 380, 506, 427, 148 and 149 of the Indian Penal Code, registered with Police Station Laddowal, Ludhiana.

As per the allegations of the injured/complainant-Madan Lal, on the day of occurrence i.e. 12.11.2015 at about 6:30 PM, the present petitioner/accused-Veer Vikram @ Sagar armed with a *Kirpan*; co-accused-Sahil armed with a *Datar* and co-accused Veer Karinder Partap @ Veeru armed with *Kirpan* accompanied by 4-5 unidentified boys armed with *Baseball Bats* and *Swords* suddenly entered his Dhaba and inflicted injuries on the complainant-Madan Lal, his nephew-Anil Kumar and servant-Rajnath at the Dhaba. The said attack was on account of a previous quarrel erupted at the Dhaba.

Learned Counsel for the petitioner/accused argues that as per the FIR, no role has been attributed to the petitioner. Secondly, he argues that the police to date has found no evidence against the petitioner.

Learned State Counsel, assisted by SI Swaran Singh, submits that the manner in which the petitioner/accused accompanied with other co-accused have inflicted injuries on the said persons in a public place with their respective weapons does not qualify for grant of anticipatory bail. He further submits that the matter is under investigation. He further submits that in the investigation conducted so far, the name of the petitioner/accused has clearly surfaced.

A perusal of the police file shows that 07 injuries have been inflicted on the complainant-Madan Lal including incised wound, two and one injuries on Anil and Rajnath respectively.

Keeping in view the manner of the offence committed and the nature of the injuries inflicted in the public place, no case for grant of anticipatory bail is made out.

Accordingly, the present petition stands dismissed.

January 07, 2016

Gagan

**(JASWANT SINGH)
JUDGE**