

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh

.....

Criminal Misc. No.M-13084 of 2017

.....

Date of decision:28.4.2017

Pratibh Sharma

...Petitioner

v.

State of Punjab

...Respondent

....

Coram: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Inderjit Singh

.....

Present: Mr. Jasmeet Singh Bedi, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. V.P.S. Sidhu, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab
for the respondent-State.

.....

Inderjit Singh, J.

The petitioner has filed this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C.
for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.132 dated 14.12.2016
registered for the offences under Sections 307, 336, 429, 452, 323, 148 and
149 IPC read with Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act at Police Station City
Budhlada, District Mansa.

Notice of motion has been issued in this case.

Mr. V.P.S. Sidhu, learned Assistant Advocate General, Punjab
has put in appearance on behalf of the respondent-State and contested this
petition.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
Assistant Advocate General, Punjab appearing for the respondent-State and

have gone through the record.

From the record, I find that Pratibh Sharma-petitioner fired a shot from his 12 bore gun in the air and the dog of the complainant started barking. Then Chetan Dass alias Toni threw a stone at the dog, upon which the dog jerked open his chain and attacked Chetan Dass alias Toni. When Kapil Dev alias Santu tried to release his brother from the dog with the help of a stick the dog attacked him also. Then Nikhil Sharma fired at the dog from his revolver upon which the dog came towards the shop and died. When the complainant protested the death of the dog at the hands of Nikhil Sharma, who with the intention to kill the complainant fired three shots continuously towards him. The complainant fell on the road and one fire hit him on the right side of his waist.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, nature and gravity of the offences and the fact that the present petitioner is required for custodial interrogation, I do not find it a fit case where the present petitioner is entitled to the benefit of anticipatory bail.

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

April 28, 2017.

(Inderjit Singh)
Judge

hsp

NOTE:	Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes
	Whether reportable:	No