

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

213)

CRM-M-24835-2019 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 18.09.2019

Punit @ Kannu and another

...
Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present:- Ms. Kamlesh, Advocate for
Mr. Parminder Singh, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. Surinder Singh, AAG, Haryana.

Amol Rattan Singh, J. (Oral)

Though the petitioner was admitted to interim bail vide an order dated July 02, 2019, on the ground that a specific role and injuries have been attributed only to the co-accused of the petitioner, i.e. Anoop and Viney, learned State counsel on instructions from ASI Manjeet, who is present in Court to assist him, submits that there are 6 injuries on the person of the complainant, one of them being with a sharp edged weapon, with such injury declared to be a grievous injury, the remaining being injuries with blunt weapons, with the allegation against the petitioner being that he was carrying a '*danda*' and also attacked the complainant along with his other co-accused.

Consequently, without making any comment on the merits of the case for or against the petitioner, in my opinion, the petitioner is not entitled to concession of anticipatory bail.

Dismissed, with the interim order vacated.

Obviously, in case of the arrest of the petitioner, if he files a petition under the provisions of Section 439 of the Cr.P.C., that petition would be considered and decided on its own merits.

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

18.09.2019

vcgarg

Whether reasoned/speaking: Yes

Whether reportable: No