

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

**CRM-M-12078-2017 (O&M)
Date of Decision:18.04.2017**

Mandip Sharma

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA.

Present:- Mr. A.S. Dhindsa, Advocate for the petitioner.

...

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA, J.

The instant petition has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. seeking concession of pre-arrest bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.03, dated 06.01.2017, under Sections 323/341/379/356/506/148/149 IPC, registered at Police Station Chhajli, District Sangrur.

Counsel for the petitioner has been heard at length and the pleadings on record have been perused.

FIR came to be registered on the statement of Narinder Pal Singh son of Sukhdev Singh. Allegations are that on 06.01.2017 while the complainant along with his wife Amarjit Kaur were proceeding from Sangrur towards Mehla Chowk in their car after having raised a sum of Rs.55,000/- from Mannapuram Finance Gold then they were accosted by another silver coloured car and from whom four unidentified youths alighted. In the meantime, it is alleged that the present petitioner armed with an iron rod also came present riding a motorcycle.

Specific allegations are with regard to the present petitioner

having inflicted four iron rod blows on the complainant and which hit on his right leg calf. Allegations further are that co-accused then snatched Rs.55,000/- from the complainant and even took away a Samsung mobile phone.

During the course of arguments, counsel has conceded the factual premise that earlier in point of time, proceedings had been initiated under the Negotiable Instruments Act at the hands of the complainant against the present petitioner as also one co-accused, namely, Jular Singh and in which they stand convicted and appeal is presently pending before the Sessions Court at Sangrur. Clearly, the complainant, as such, was in a position to identify the present petitioner. The allegations against the present petitioner are specific in nature i.e. of having inflicted iron rod blows on the right leg of the complainant. A perusal of the order dated 21.02.2017 passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sangrur while declining the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner would reveal that the police file had been seen and the allegations set up by the complainant were duly supported by the medical evidence/MLR which reflected multiple injuries on the person of the complainant.

In the light of such specific allegations levelled against the petitioner and which are corroborated by medical evidence, this Court is not inclined to extend in favour of the petitioner, concession of pre-arrest bail.

Petition is dismissed.

18.04.2017

harjeet

**(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE**

- | | | |
|-----|----------------------------|-----|
| i) | Whether speaking/reasoned? | Yes |
| ii) | Whether reportable? | No |