

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

**CRM-M No.38542 of 2016 (O&M)**

Date of decision: 24<sup>th</sup> March, 2017

Paramjit

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE FATEH DEEP SINGH**

Present: Mr. D.K. Tuteja, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Munish Sharma, Asstt. Advocate General, Haryana  
for the respondent/State.

**FATEH DEEP SINGH, J.**

Allegations against the petitioner Paramjit in this petition filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C. seeking regular bail are that on 07.05.2016 around 10.30 p.m. when complainant Ajay Kumar was in his house, 4/5 persons knocked at his door who all were armed with dangerous weapons and on their asking the complainant opened the door and the accused persons trespassed into his house and assaulted him along with his family members. The motive behind this was that son of the complainant namely Amardeep was running a hotel which was adjacent to the house of the accused Jaswant and who used to object and force the complainant side to close down the business and with the help of his co-accused had assaulted them. It was subsequently as a result of this, complainant Ajay Kumar died on 24.05.2016.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has sought to make submissions on the grounds that the petitioner is neither named in the FIR nor any role has been attributed to him in commission of the offence and is in custody since 12.07.2016 and the death is not attributable to the alleged occurrence and is a natural consequence of having gone against the medical advice.

Learned State counsel has sought to oppose grant of bail to the petitioner on the grounds of heinousness of the offence and the fact that if allowed bail he would influence the witnesses.

Appreciating the submissions, it is in the statement of son of the deceased, name of the accused who were known to each other has been spelled out. It is by no means differed that it was as a consequence of the injuries inflicted at the hands of the accused has led to death of the deceased. The mere fact as to the period of incarceration is no ground to allow relief to the petitioner. In the light of heinousness of the offence and seriousness of the allegations and the apprehension of the State that if allowed bail the petitioner would influence the witnesses is not unfounded, does not calls for grant of bail to the petitioner.

Dismissed.

**(FATEH DEEP SINGH)**  
**JUDGE**

**March 24, 2017**

*rps*

Whether speaking/reasoned  
Whether reportable

Yes/No  
Yes/No