

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

107

**CRM-M-48232-2018 (O&M)
Date of Decision : 31.10.2018**

Paramjeet Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

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

Present: Mr. G.S.Sandhu, Advocate for the petitioner.

P.B. BAJANTHRI, J.(ORAL)

In the present petition, petitioner has sought for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No. 77 dated 31.07.2018 (Annexure P-1) under Sections 307, 341, 506, 34 IPC and Sections 25 and 27 of Arms Act, registered at Police Station Nandgarh, District Bathinda wherein later on Sections 307 IPC and Section 25 Arms Act, have been deleted vide DDR no. 35 dated 17.09.2018 and Section 336 IPC, Section 27 of Arms Act, have been added.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner vehemently contended that initially Section 307 IPC was incorporated in the FIR later on by virtue of DDR it has been deleted. Therefore, what remains is other sections which are mentioned in the FIR. It was also contended that no recovery is due as the gun is already recovered by the Investigating Authority. Thus he is entitled for anticipatory bail.

3. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner.

4. Perusal of the FIR it is evident that even though petitioner is licence holder of a gun. At the same time he used the gun to threaten the

complainant with the aim to kill him and put the muzzle of gun on the complainant's chest and fired but by god grace complainant rescued himself. Such incident is taken place in the general public. Such incident could not be treated lightly as it was nothing but terrorizing the general public. Even though if the petitioner has not committed offence under Section 307 IPC at the same time he fired gunshot which could hit anybody. Therefore, he is not entitled for anticipatory bail. Accordingly, petition stands dismissed.

31.10.2018
pooja saini

(P.B. BAJANTHRI)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned?</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable?</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>