

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh

.....

Criminal Misc. Nos.31690 and 31691 of 2018
and
Criminal Misc. No.M-32071 of 2018

Date of decision:13.9.2018

Sukhdeep Singh and another

...Petitioners

v.

State of Punjab

...Respondent

....

Coram: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Inderjit Singh

.....

Present: Mr. Amandeep Chhabra, Advocate for the petitioners.

Ms. Monika Jalota, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab for the
respondent-State.

Mr. A.S. Salar, Advocate for the complainant.

.....

Inderjit Singh, J.

Cr. Misc. No.31690 of 2018:

For the reasons mentioned in the criminal miscellaneous application, FIR No.175 dated 21.8.2018 (Annexure-C.1) annexed with the application is taken on record subject to just all exceptions.

The criminal miscellaneous application is allowed.

Cr. Misc. No.M-32071 of 2018:

The petitioners have filed this petition under Section 438

[2]

Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.91 dated 2.5.2018 registered for the offences under Sections 326, 452, 324, 323, 148 and 149 IPC at Police Station Maur, District Bathinda.

Notice of motion has been issued in this case.

Ms. Monika Jalota, learned Deputy Advocate General, Punjab has appeared on behalf of the respondent-State and Mr. A.S. Salar, learned Advocate has appeared for the complainant and contested this petition.

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

As per the allegations, it is a case of version and cross-version. Sukhdev Singh-petitioner No.1 was stated to be armed with a 'Kirch' and gave grievous injury on the left hand whereas Maninderjit Singh-petitioner No.2 was stated to be armed with a 'Gandasi' and gave injury from the reverse side of 'Gandasi'. It has been brought to my notice that after this case against the petitioners, second FIR has been registered for causing injuries to the complainant and separate proceedings under Sections 107/151 Cr.P.C. were also initiated against them.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case, without discussing the facts in minute detail and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, I do not find it a fit case where the petitioners are entitled for the benefit of anticipatory bail.

Therefore, finding no merit in this petition, the same is dismissed.

Cr. Misc. No.31691 of 2018:

[3]

Since main petition has been dismissed, therefore, this application has rendered infructuous and the same is dismissed accordingly.

September 13, 2018.

(Inderjit Singh)
Judge

hsp

NOTE:	Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes
	Whether reportable:	No