

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

103

**CRM-M-35739-2018 (O&M)**

**Date of Decision:-27.08.2018**

Sahil Arora

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE P.B. BAJANTHRI**

Present: Mr. Anmol Rattan Singh, Senior Advocate with  
Mr. Pratham Sethi, Advocate for the petitioner.

**P.B. BAJANTHRI, J.(ORAL)**

In the present petition, petitioner seeks anticipatory bail under the provision of Section 438 Cr.P.C. in FIR No. 191 dated 30.07.2018 under Sections 307/323/341/336/337/160/148/149/120-B of IPC and Section 25/27/54 of Arms Act, registered at Police Station Division No. 6, Jalandhar.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner vehemently contended that petitioner is only a student. On the other hand, members of the Lahoria family attacked the petitioner and others. In other words, it is a group clash. No weapon was used by the petitioner. On the other hands weapons were used by Sandeep and Puneet.

3. Perusal of the order passed in bail application No. 9753 of 2018 at para 5 it is evident that due to group clash between the petitioner and others resulted in throwing stones and bricks upon each other and fired gun shot from 12 bore double barrel gun towards general public as many people were assembled at the place of occurrence. Thus, there is disturbance among the general public who are moving around there on the spot and their freedom was curtailed due to scuffle among the groups of persons including petitioner. Having regard to the allegations it is not a fit case to extend the

benefit of anticipatory bail as there is requirement of custodial interrogation to find out the involvement as well as recovery of weapons. Moreover, learned counsel for the petitioner fails to apprise the fact whether the recovery has been effected or not.

4. Accordingly, petition stands dismissed.

27.08.2018

pooja saini

( P.B. BAJANTHRI )  
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasons:

Yes/No

Whether Reportable:

Yes/No