

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

**CRM No.1969 of 2019 in/and
CRM No.M-33258 of 2018
Date of Decision: May 01, 2019**

Husan Lal

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

Present: Mr.Jagjit Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms.Monika Jalota, DAG, Punjab
for the respondent-State.

Mr.Lekhraj Sharma, Advocate
for respondents No.2 to 7.

INDERJIT SINGH, J.

CRM No.1969 of 2019

The application is allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

Written statement alongwith annexures is taken on record.

CRM No.M-33258 of 2018

Petitioner has filed this petition under Section 439(2) Cr.P.C.
for cancellation of anticipatory bail granted to respondents No.2 to 7 by
learned Addl. Sessions Judge, Ludhiana, in case FIR No.17 dated
04.04.2017 under Sections 308, 379-B, 353, 186, 332, 323, 341, 506, 148,
149 IPC and Section 27 of the Arms Act, registered at Police Station

Division No.7, Ludhiana.

Notice of motion was issued. Learned State counsel as well as learned counsel for respondents No.2 to 7 appeared and contested the petition.

From the record, I find that FIR in the present case has been got registered by Husan Lal (petitioner), SHO, Police Station Moti Nagar, Ludhiana, regarding the occurrence took place on 13.01.2017 at about 1.30 a.m. As per the FIR, the accused caused injuries etc. and tried to run over the police party by turning the vehicle and have also taken away government pistol of the complainant.

On the other hand, learned counsel for respondents No.2 to 7 contended that the complainant-petitioner was not in uniform and private respondents were feeling that some snatchers are trying to snatch their vehicle etc. He further contended that no such occurrence has taken place as mentioned in the FIR. He also contended that an enquiry was got conducted by the SSP regarding the occurrence and one of the FIR got registered by present petitioner qua the occurrence was ordered to be cancelled and as per enquiry report, some of the allegations made in the FIR are not found corroborated.

After hearing learned counsel for the parties as well as learned State counsel and after going through the FIR and impugned order, I find that the petitioner-complainant has suffered simple minor injuries including complaint of pain etc. and in the facts and circumstances of the present case, learned Court of Session has not committed any illegality while granting anticipatory bail to the private respondents. Nothing has been argued that

private respondents have ever tried to tamper with the evidence or they have

ever misused the concession of anticipatory bail. Therefore, no ground is made out for cancelling the bail granted to respondents No.2 to 7.

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

May 01, 2019	(INDERJIT SINGH)
Vgulati	JUDGE
Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether reportable	No