

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

CRM-M No.6694 of 2017

Date of Decision: 01.03.2017

Surjeet Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

CORAM:-HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH

Present:Mr. J.S. Kundu, Advocate
for the petitioner.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J.(ORAL)

Petitioner seeks cancellation of bail granted to respondents No.2 to 7 by the Court of Sessions at Panipat vide orders dated 21.07.2016 and 29.08.2016 in FIR No.230 dated 01.07.2016 registered under Sections 148, 149, 323, 452, 506, 326 IPC and Section 3 of SC/ST Act at Police Station Matlauda, Panipat.

While granting bail, Special Judge, Panipat has observed that none of the injuries on the person of the complainant was found grievous, nor any specific injury was attributed to Pardeep @ Kala on the neck of the complainant's brother. As per medico legal report, no injury on the back was reported. The role assigned to Vijay and Amarnath was vague enough to cover the alleged culpability. Similarly, alleged instance to attract culpability in terms of Section 3 of ST/SC Act was also found to be belatedly added. As per X-ray report

submitted by the Investigating Officer, no fracture was detected qua injury No.1 and injury was declared to be simple in nature. The only injury reported in the MLR of Ramphal was described as “complain of difficulty in vision from right eye”. There was no *prima facie* material on record showing injury No.2 to be grievous in nature.

Orders granting bail by the Court of Sessions cannot be faulted with merely on the oral assertion of the complainant that the accused party has misused the concession of bail.

Dismissed.

01.03.2017
prince

(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether Reasoned/Speaking

Yes/No

Whether Reportable

Yes/No