

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

CRM-M-37267-2017(O&M)

Date of decision: December 02, 2017

Rukamdeen

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.B. CHAUDHARI

Present: Mr.Manoj Pundhir, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms.Tanisha Peshawaria, DAG, Haryana.

A.B. CHAUDHARI, J (Oral)

Heard learned counsel for the rival parties.

The petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No. 150 dated 12.07.2017, under Sections 148, 149, 323, 324, 452 and 506 IPC(Sections 148 and 149 of IPC deleted and Section 34 IPC added later on), registered at Police Station Sadar, Yamuna Nagar, District Yamuna Nagar.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the FIR was lodged on 12.07.2017 by wife of the injured in respect of the alleged incident which took place on 08.07.2017. He further submitted that there is a litigation going on between the parties. He further submitted that the petitioner is a person of the age of 65 years.

I have perused the FIR. Perusal of the same shows that the petitioner along with the other co-accused entered the house of the complainant and inflicted an injury in the abdomen of the complainant's

husband with a knife while the others gave him blows with lathies and dandas.

The allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature as he had hit the husband of the complainant with a knife on the vital part of his body. Apart from that, I have also gone through the order passed by the trial Court cancelling his application for anticipatory bail wherein, in para 6, the trial Court has observed that previously also the petitioner and his son had committed similar kind of offence regarding which an FIR was also registered. No prima facie case was found in favour of the petitioner and his bail application was dismissed. The argument of learned counsel for the petitioner with regard to delay in lodging the FIR does not hold ground in view of the fact that the husband of the complainant was injured and this might have been the cause of delay in lodging the FIR.

Accordingly no ground for grant of anticipatory bail is made out.

Petition is dismissed.

(A.B.CHAUDHARI)
JUDGE

December 02, 2017
sunita

Whether speaking/reasoned Yes/No

Whether Reportable Yes/No