

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

CRM No. M-33326 of 2016 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 19.09.2017.

Meena Rathi

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM : Hon'ble Mr. Justice Jitendra Chauhan

Present : Mr. Gaurav Mohunta, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Mahima Yashpal, AAG Haryana.

Mr. Manish Soni, Advocate,
for the complainant.

JITENDRA CHAUHAN.J.(ORAL)

The present petition has been filed under Section 438 the Cr.P.C seeking anticipatory bail in case FIR No.457 dated 12.08.2016 registered under Sections 307, 354-A, 509, 323, 325, 342 and 506 read with Section 34 IPC at Police Station Civil Lines, Gurgaon.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the the injuries on the person of the petitioner, who is complainant in the cross, case have not been appreciated by the I.O and a cancellation report has been filed in the cross case. It is asserted that fair and proper investigation in the matter has not been carried out.

On the other hand, the learned State counsel opposes the bail application. It is submitted that injured Santosh Devi suffered

12 injuries including 8 fractures. The petitioner is named in the FIR.

Heard.

Considering the fact that injured Santosh Devi suffered as many as 12 injuries including 8 fractures which as per the doctor concerned, are collectively dangerous to life. This is also to be noticed that the MLR of injured Santosh Devi was prepared without any delay and the petitioner has been specifically named in the FIR. Taking into consideration the number, the nature and the seat of injuries, this Court feels that no case for grant of concession of anticipatory bail is made out at this stage.

Consequently, the petition is dismissed.

Anything said herein above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

19.09.2017.
SN

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

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