

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

CRM-M-534-2018

Date of decision:-13.3.2018

Aman @ Rinku

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE H.S.MADAAN

Present: Mr. Rakesh Nehra, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr.Surender Singh, AAG, Haryana.

H.S. MADAAN, J.

This petition for regular bail has been filed by Aman @ Rinku – an accused in FIR No.264 dated 28.6.2017, under Sections 307, 324, 34, 120-B, 506 IPC and 25 of Arms Act, registered at Police Station Urban Estate, Rohtak, District Rohtak.

Briefly stated, the facts of the case as per prosecution version are that FIR in question was recorded on the basis of written complaint submitted by complainant – Shamsher son of Jai Singh, resident of village Bohar, District Rohtak to SHO, Police Station Urban Estate, Rohtak wherein he contended that accused Aman @ Rinku residing at house of his maternal uncle had quarrelled with Krishan son of complainant twice,

however, the matter was compromised on both the occasions; that on 27.6.2017 when Krishan son of the complainant went for racing on IMT Road, then Aman @ Rinku along with his friends caused injuries to Krishan with knife; that Krishan was admitted in hospital and that maternal uncle of Aman @ Rinku is also involved in the incident. The petitioner accused arrested in this case on 2.7.2017 and the knife used in the incident was recovered from his possession on 3.7.2017. Since initially the FIR had been registered for the offence under Section 324 IPC etc., the petitioner was granted bail by the Court below on 10.7.2017. However, when offence under Section 307 IPC was added, he was arrested again in this case. The petitioner had moved an application for regular bail, which was dismissed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Rohtak vide order dated 16.12.2017, as such, he has approached this Court asking for similar relief.

Notice of the petition was given to respondent – State and counsel representing the State has put in appearance.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties besides going through the record.

The allegations against the petitioner are very serious. As per the prosecution story, he had given several blows of knife to the injured hitting him on waist, arm, wrist, neck and chest, majority of the blows on vital parts of the body. The very fact that he had entered into quarrel with the injured twice earlier though the matter had been compromised but for the third time he attacked him with a dangerous weapon causing him multiple injuries, majority of those on vital parts, such type of person does

not deserve concession of regular bail since there is every likelihood of his taking to path of crime again and trying to influence the prosecution witnesses and even absconding, if granted bail. The contention of learned counsel for the petitioner that there is delay in lodging of the FIR and initially the FIR was registered for offence under Section 324 IPC do not have much bearing while deciding an application for bail, though they may be relevant during the trial.

Thus, finding no merits in the petition, the same stands dismissed.

13.3.2018
Brij

(H.S.MADAAN)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No