

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

Sr. No. 101

CRM-M-287-2017

Decided on : 11.01.2017

Lalit

..... Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Haryana

..... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK SIBAL

Present: Mr.Sandeep Kumar Yadav, Advocate, for the petitioner.

DEEPAK SIBAL, J. (ORAL)

Through the present petition filed under Section 438 Cr. P. C., the petitioner seeks the concession of the grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No. 573, dated 18.11.2016, registered under Section 186/332/353/34 IPC (Section 333 IPC added later on), at Police Station City Narnaul, District Mohindergarh.

The case of the prosecution, as borne out from the record, is that the petitioner alongwith others armed with *lathies* and *dandas* were indulging in rioting and were beating up an unknown person and when the complainant-a police official tried to intervene, the petitioner alongwith his co-accused attacked the complainant and inflicted grievous injuries upon him. During the course of investigation, CCTV footage was collected in which the identity of at least three of the assailants including that of the petitioner was duly established.

The petitioner alongwith others was found to be indulging in rioting and giving beatings to an unknown person. When the complainant-a

police official tried to intervene, the petitioner alongwith others gave merciless beating to him, resulting in number of injuries to him including injuries of grievous nature.

The allegations against the petitioner for causing grievous injuries are serious and the same assume a higher degree of seriousness when these injuries are inflicted upon a police official who was only seeking to do his duty. Further, only 3 of the 6-7 assailants have been identified with the help of CCTV footage. The identity of the remaining accused is yet to be established and after the same is done, they are required to be proceeded against, in accordance with law. Recovery of weapons used in the occurrence is also yet to be made.

In view of the above, I do not consider the present case a fit case for the grant of concession of anticipatory bail.

Dismissed.

11.01.2017
shamsher

[DEEPAK SIBAL]
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes / No

Whether reportable : Yes / No