

202-A

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

1.

**CRM-M No.34554 of 2016
Date of Decision: 19.01.2017**

Sukhwinder Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondents

2.

CRM-M No.37020 of 2016

Harcharan Singh @ Heero

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK SIBAL

Present: Mr. Achin Gupta, Advocate and
Mr. Ashish Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Neeraj Yadav, AAG, Punjab.

DEEPAK SIBAL J. (ORAL)

It is agreed by learned counsel for the parties that both the petitioners in the aforementioned petitions filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.85, dated 06.08.2016, registered under Sections 307/427/148 and 149 IPC (Section 325 IPC added later on), at Police Station Jaito, District Faridkot, have been attributed similar roles by the prosecution and, therefore, their petitions can be decided by a common order.

The injury attributed to the petitioners is with an iron rod on the head of Amrit Pal Singh-injured and the said injury on his head is alleged to have been declared dangerous to life.

A specific role has been attributed to the petitioners in the commission of a serious crime in which an attempt was made to murder Amrit Pal Singh-injured. The presence of the petitioners is admitted at the place of occurrence and as per the prosecution, after committing the crime, the petitioners fled away from the spot.

Keeping in view the totality of facts as noticed above, without commenting on the merits of the cases, I am of the opinion that these cases are not fit for grant of concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

Petitions stand dismissed.

Nothing observed hereinabove shall be considered to be an expression of opinion by this Court on the merits of the case.

(DEEPAK SIBAL)
JUDGE

January 19, 2017

rittu

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No