

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

Criminal Misc. No.M- 33330 of 2017(O&M)

Date of Decision: November 2 , 2017.

Gurmeet Singh PETITIONER (s)

Versus

State of Punjab RESPONDENT (s)

CORAM:- HON'BLE MRS.JUSTICE LISA GILL

Present: Mr. Sandeep Chopra, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rahul Rathore, DAG, Punjab

1. Whether reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?
2. To be referred to the reporters or not?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest?

LISA GILL, J.

Prayer in this petition is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.144 dated 10.07.2017 under Sections 354/323/148/149/506 IPC registered at Police Station Urban Estate, Patiala, District Patiala.

Contentions on behalf of the petitioner noticed by this Court on 08.09.2017 while issuing notice of motion read as under:-

“It is submitted that a scuffle took place between the parties on 09.07.2017 on account of an altercation regarding certain articles which had been kept by Charanjit Kaur at the residence of the complainant's sister. Allegations have been falsely raised in the

FIR merely for the addition of the offence punishable under Section 354 IPC.”

Petitioner stated to be young boy aged nineteen years, is submitted to be falsely implicated in this case. It is further submitted that no action has been taken by the police authorities against the complainant and others in respect to the injuries received by the petitioner's mother, sister and wife. Reference is made to Annexures P2 to P4. It is submitted that the petitioner has joined investigation and he undertakes to face the proceedings and not misuse the concession of anticipatory bail, if afforded to him. Therefore, it is prayed that this petition be allowed.

Learned counsel for the State, on instructions from HC Kuldeep Singh, verifies that the petitioner has joined investigation. It is submitted that the medico legal reports (Annexures P2 to P4) indicate that the medical examination was conducted at 5.50 p.m. whereas, the occurrence in question is alleged to have taken place in the afternoon of 09.07.2017, thus no action has been taken thereon. However, it is not denied that FIR in question was registered at 5.45 p.m. It is verified by learned counsel for the State that the petitioner is not involved in any other criminal case. No recovery is to be effected from him. Two of the five accused have been granted the concession of bail pending trial and another two have been afforded the concession of anticipatory bail.

There are no allegations on behalf of the State that the petitioner is likely to abscond or that he is likely to dissuade the witnesses from deposing true facts in the Court, if released on bail.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances as above but without commenting upon or expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, this petition is allowed. Consequently, order dated 08.09.2017 is made absolute.

It is clarified that none of the observations made hereinabove shall be construed to be a reflection on the merits of the case. The same are solely confined for the purpose of decision of the present petition.

November 2 , 2017.
'om'

(**LISA GILL**)
JUDGE

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