

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

(i)

CRM No.M-7485 of 2017 (O&M)

Bunty alias Gagandeep Singh

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab

...Respondent

(ii)

CRM No.M-7962 of 2017 (O&M)

Sewak Singh alias Gursewak Singh

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab

...Respondent

Date of Decision: April 19, 2017

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

Present: Mr.Sonpreet Singh Brar, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr.V.P.S.Sidhu, Asstt. Advocate General, Punjab
for the respondent-State.

INDERJIT SINGH, J.

Both the above-mentioned cases are taken up together as the same have arisen from same FIR.

Petitioners have filed these petitions under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.145 dated 08.10.2016 under Sections 324, 323 and 34 IPC (Section 326 IPC added later on), registered at Police Station Nahianwala, District Bathinda.

Notice of motion was issued. Learned State counsel appeared

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioners as well as learned State counsel and have gone through the record.

From the record, I find that Bunty @ Gagandeep Singh is stated to be armed with *kirpan* and he gave injury on the right wrist of the complainant, which injury has been declared as simple. The grievous injury is attributed to the co-accused. Petitioner Bunty @ Gagandeep Singh was earlier arrested for bailable offences and *kirpan* has already been recovered from him. Later on Section 326 IPC has been added.

Petitioner Sewak Singh @ Gursewak Singh is stated to be armed with *dang* and simply injury has been attributed to him. The injured has not got conducted X-ray examination despite the advice of the doctor.

The petitioners have already joined the investigation. They are not required for custodial interrogation. The trial of the case will take long time. No useful purpose will be served by sending the petitioners to custody.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case and without discussing the facts of the case in minute details and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, I find it a fit case, where the petitioners are entitled to benefit of grant of anticipatory bail. Therefore, both the petitions are accepted and the order dated 06.03.2017 passed in CRM No.M-7485 of 2017 and order dated 08.03.2017 passed in CRM No.M-7962 of 2017 granting interim bail to the petitioners, are made absolute.

April 19, 2017
Vgulati

(INDERJIT SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes
No