

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

(i) Criminal Misc. No.M-17518 of 2018 (O&M)
Gorav ... Petitioner

Versus
UT, Chandigarh ... Respondent

(ii) Criminal Misc. No.M-22779 of 2018 (O&M)
Mukesh alias Jony ... Petitioner

Versus
UT, Chandigarh ... Respondent

(iii) Criminal Misc. No.M-36333 of 2018 (O&M)
Vishal Sharma alias Bhaman ... Petitioner

Versus
UT, Chandigarh ... Respondent

Date of decision : 27.08.2018

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ SHEKHAR ATTRI

Present: Mr. Simranjeet Singh Sarwara, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Gautam Dutt, Addl. Public Prosecutor
for the respondent-UT, Chandigarh.

Mr. Rajeev Duggal, Advocate
for the complainant.

RAJ SHEKHAR ATTRI, J.(Oral)

This order shall dispose of Criminal Misc.No.M-17518 of 2018, filed by petitioner Gorav, Criminal Misc.No.M-22779 of 2018, filed by petitioner Mukesh alias Jony and Criminal Misc.No.M-36333 of 2018, filed by petitioner Vishal Sharma alias Bhaman under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.112 dated 14.03.2018, registered under Sections 147, 148, 149, 452, 506, 427, 307 IPC, at Police Station Sector 31, Chandigarh.

Briefly stated, it is a case of prosecution that on 14.03.2018,

Deepa, Sundi, Sibbi, Bahman, Gurav, Jhony, Kishan alongwith other persons having swords, big knives and rods in their hands forcibly trespassed into the house of complainant. One of them namely Deepa attacked on the head of the mother of the complainant with sharp edged weapon. Sundi attacked her giving blow on her face with a sharp edged weapon. Sibbi also caused injury on her leg with the stick. When younger brother of complainant Pooran came forward to rescue his mother from their hands then all of them caught hold him and Deepa caused a blow with a chopper (a knife like instrument) on his eye.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record.

The petitioners formed an unlawful assembly. They forcibly entered the house of complainant and caused injuries to Smt.Asha Devi and Puran respectively.

The investigating agency wants to recover the weapon of the offence.

To the mind of this Court, custodial interrogation is necessary.

Keeping in view the seriousness of the offence and the circumstances of the case, the petitioners are not entitled to the concession of anticipatory bail.

Accordingly, the aforesaid petitions stand dismissed.

(RAJ SHEKHAR ATTRI)
JUDGE

27.08.2018
mamta

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No