

101/205
IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-43676-2018 in/and
CRM-M-38448-2018 (O&M)
Date of decision : 7.12.2018

Charanjit Singh Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. Ferry Sofat, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Karanbir Singh, AAG, Punjab.

1. *Whether the Reporters of local newspaper may be allowed to see the judgment ?*
2. *To be referred to the Reporter or not.*
3. *Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest ?*

KULDIP SINGH J. (ORAL)

CRM-43676-2018

Application is allowed as prayed for.

CRM-M-38448-2018

This is an application for grant of bail under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure in case FIR No. 54 dated 07.07.2018 under Sections 332, 353, 186 and 333 of the Indian Penal Code registered at Police Station Ghanie-Ke-Banger, District Gurdaspur.

Heard.

Police file has been perused.

It comes out that FIR was registered against the petitioner on a complaint filed by Hardev Singh who was as Block Officer in Forest Department and the present petitioner-Charanjit Singh is working as a Forest Guard in north area of Talwandi. When the complainant asked the petitioner to show the concerned register so that he can investigate

regarding the allegations of deforesting the area, Charanjit Singh-petitioner assaulted the complainant and hit him with the stick on the head and leg. As a result of which turban of the complainant fell down and blood oozed out from the injuries. A perusal of the MLR shows that two injuries were received. First of the injury is on the parietal region and other is radius abrasion. First injury was found to be grievous in nature by the doctor.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that there is 8 days delay in lodging the FIR. He has argued that the Range Officer-Amrik Singh has been found innocent by the police. Petitioner and the complainant work in the same department and that false allegations have been levelled against the petitioner. In the FIR, there are no allegations that Amrik Singh also assaulted the complainant. Allegations are against the present petitioner and injury No. 1 was found to be grievous in nature. Therefore, it is not a case of undue hardship to grant anticipatory bail to the present petitioner.

Dismissed accordingly.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

7.12.2018

preeti

Whether speaking / reasoned
Whether Reportable:

Yes
No