

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

**CRM-M No. 20062 of 2020
Date of Decision:29.07.2020**

NARINDER SINGH

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK SIBAL

Present: Mr. Harsh Bungar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. J.S. Ghumman, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Vikas Bali, Advocate
for the complainant.

DEEPAK SIBAL, J. (ORAL)

Case taken up through video conferencing. The present petition has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for the grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.60 dated 05.04.2020 registered under Sections 324, 506 and 34 IPC (Section 326 IPC added later on) at Police Station Kartarpur, District Jalandhar.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case due to pending civil dispute between the parties; the version in the FIR qua his son is found to be false and therefore the entire story set up in the FIR should be discarded and that the injury attributed to the petitioner is simple in nature which has wrongly

been described as a grievous injury.

Learned State counsel opposes the grant of anticipatory bail on the ground that the petitioner has been attributed a grievous injury on the head of the complainant measuring 10cm x 0.5cm; the weapon used in the crime is yet to be recovered and it is likely that if the petitioner is granted interim bail he may influence the prosecution witnesses.

The petitioner has been attributed a grievous injury on the head of the complainant; the spade, which is the weapon allegedly used in the crime, is yet to be recovered; the motive behind the alleged attack is to be deciphered and in view of the fact that on the last date of hearing the present petition had been adjourned on the request of the learned counsel for the petitioner to explore the possibilities of compromise, it cannot be ruled out that if the petitioner is granted anticipatory bail, he may influence the injured/prosecution witnesses.

In view of the above custodial interrogation of the petitioner is considered necessary.

Dismissed.

July 29, 2020

Jyoti-IV

(DEEPAK SIBAL)
JUDGE

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