

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM No. M-2173 of 2017 (O&M)

Date of Decision:07.03.2017

Ravinder Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

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

Present:- Mr. Ritesh Aggarwal, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Gaurav Narang, Advocate,
for the complainant.

Ms. Harpreet K. Athwal, DAG, Punjab.

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA, J.(ORAL)

CRM No.7752 of 2017

Prayer in the application is for amendment/correction in the head note as also prayer clause in the main petition.

Notice in the application.

On the asking of the Court, Ms. Harpreet K. Athwal, DAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the State. Notice is also accepted by Mr. Gaurav Narang, Advocate who is present in Court on behalf of the complainant.

In the light of averments made in the application and by recording no objection of learned State counsel as well as counsel appearing for the complainant, prayer is allowed. In the head note as also the prayer clause, instead of Sections 326 and 34 IPC, the same would now be read as Sections 326 and 324 IPC.

Application is accordingly disposed of.

CRM No.M-2173 of 2017

The instant petition has been filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C. seeking regular bail to the petitioner pending trial in case FIR No.116 dated 22.08.2016, under Sections 307, 326, 324 of IPC, registered at Police Station Sadar Patiala.

Counsel for the parties have been heard.

FIR has been registered on the statement of Ranjit Kaur in relation to an occurrence that took place on 22.08.2016. Complainant is none other than the wife of the present petitioner.

The specific and direct attribution to the petitioner is having attacked the complainant with a *datar* and having inflicted injuries on the head, on the right wrist joint, left elbow as also the left ankle.

The version of the complainant finds corroboration from the medical record. During the course of hearing, learned State counsel who is on instructions from ASI Karnail Singh has referred to the MLR of the complainant upon her examination at the Civil Hospital and Medical College, Patiala and wherein the following injuries have been noticed:

Sr. No.	Injuries	Marked	Injury Number
1	Incised wound of size 20x6 cm present on front of left forearm with partial avulsion of skin and underlying tissue 4x1 cm and 5x0.5 cm on front of left hand, fresh bleeding present. Adv. X-ray and ortho opinion	Yes	3
2	Incised wound of size 6x0.8 cm present on top of head just lateral to midline placed obliquely and incised wound of size 2 x 0.3 cm on left ankle. Adv X-ray and surgeon opinion	Yes	1
3	Incised wounds of sizes 8x3 cm, 5x2.5cm and 4x1 cm present on front of right wrist joint, medial aspect of right forearm on lower one third part. Fresh bleeding present. Adv. X-ray and ortho opinion	Yes	2

<i>Sr. No.</i>	<i>Injuries</i>	<i>Marked</i>	<i>Injury Number</i>
4	Incised wound of size 6x0.5 cm present on back of left elbow. Fresh bleeding present. Adv. X-ray and ortho opinion	Yes	4

Injuries No.2 and 3 have been opined to be grievous in nature and injuries No.1 and 4 have been opined to be simple.

The present petitioner is the sole accused.

The complainant's version finds complete corroboration from medical evidence.

In the light of serious allegations and the brutality of the attack by a husband i.e. present petitioner on the person of the complainant i.e. the wife, this Court is not inclined to extend the benefit of regular bail to the petitioner at this stage.

Petition is dismissed.

07.03.2017

vandana

(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether Reportable	Yes