

103

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-3729-2019

Date of decision-29.01.2019

Sahibjit Singh @ Saab @ Saabi

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Mr. Ritesh Pandey, Advocate for the petitioner.

MANOJ BAJAJ, J.

Sahibjit Singh @ Saab @ Saabi has prayed for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.30 dated 29.04.2013 under Sections 326, 324, 323 and 341 read with Section 34 of Indian Penal Code registered at Police Station Qilla Lal Singh, District Batala.

The FIR was recorded on the statement of complainant, namely, Dilraj Singh son of Gurkirpal Singh with the allegations that he is pursuing his diploma course of Electrical Engineering from Batala. On 26.04.2013, complainant went for jogging and there when he passed across the bridge at 6.30 p.m., four boys came on two motor cycles. Two of them, namely, Sahibjit Singh (petitioner) and Major Singh were recognized. All four encircled him and Sahibjit Singh exhorted that the complainant be taught a lesson for old altercation which took place during their study course. As per the allegations, the attack was opened by Sahibjit Singh who gave datar blow on the left leg below the knee and another blow was given at left arm.

The other assailants also participated and caused injuries.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that after the registration of the FIR, he had given application to the Police that he is innocent. According to him, inquiry commenced on that application and on 15.12.2013, the petitioner left for Italy. It is pointed out that on 30.05.2016, the petitioner was declared proclaimed offender. Learned counsel contends that the petitioner is willing to participate in the trial.

After hearing learned counsel for the petitioner, this Court does not find any reason to show any indulgence keeping in view the conduct of the petitioner. Firstly the petitioner himself was having the motive and opened the attack by causing injuries, besides after the registration of the case, instead of submitting himself before the Court, he left India. At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner contends that sister of the petitioner getting married on 04.02.2019 and the reliance is placed upon the Marriage Card (Annexure P-5).

This Court does not find any reason to extend the extra ordinary concession of pre arrest bail to the petitioner.

Consequently, petition is dismissed.

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

29.01.2019
vanita

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes	No
Whether Reportable :	Yes	No