

CRM-M-45203-2018

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

CRM-M-45203-2018

Date of Decision: 16.11.2018

Kuldeep Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

Present: Mr. Akshit Aggarwal, Advocate for
Mr. Sunny K. Singla, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Monika Jalota, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. K.B.S.Mann, Advocate,
for the respondent.

INDERJIT SINGH, J. (Oral)

IOIN-CRM-M-45203-2018

Registry has put up the file for correction of next date in the
order dated 23.10.2018.

Report perused.

In the last order dated 23.10.2018, next date of hearing is
inadvertently mentioned as 12.10.2018. The mistake being clerical is
apparent on record.

Learned counsel for the parties as well as learned State counsel
who appear on their own, request that main petition be taken up today, itself
for final hearing.

CRM-M-45203-2018

Request allowed.

Ordered accordingly.

Disposed of.

CRM-M-45203-2018

Petitioner-Kuldeep Singh has filed this petition under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (for brevity, 'Cr.P.C.') for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.126 dated 16.07.2018, registered at Police Station Lehra, District Sangrur, under Sections 341, 323, 308 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

Notice of motion was issued in this case. Learned State counsel put in appearance on behalf of the respondent-State and complainant also appeared through his counsel. They contested this petition.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties as well as learned State counsel and have gone through the record. Police record is also available.

From the record, I find that as per the prosecution version, the present petitioner is stated to be armed with *kahi* and gave two continuous blows of the same on the head of complainant-Gurdeep Singh. Both these injuries have been declared dangerous to life. The present petitioner is the main accused.

Keeping in view the nature and gravity of the offence and in view of the fact that the petitioner is required for custodial interrogation, I do not find it a fit case where the petitioner is entitled to the benefit of

CRM-M-45203-2018

anticipatory bail.

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

16.11.2018
parveen kumar

(INDERJIT SINGH)
JUDGE

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