

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

CRM-M-22027-2020
Date of decision: 07.08.2020

Harjinder Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

Present:- Mr. Vinod K. Kaushal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Joginder Pal Ratra, DAG, Punjab.

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J. (Oral)

The petitioner prays for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No. 111 dated 18.07.2020, registered under Sections 353, 186, 379-B, 342, 323, 506, 148 and 149 of the IPC (Section 332 IPC added later on) at Police Station Mehta, District Amritsar (Rural).

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that as per the allegations in the FIR, registered at the instance of ASI Gurmeet Singh, it is stated that he is the investigating officer in FIR No. 207 dated 19.08.2019, registered under Sections 420, 506 and 120-B of the IPC at Police Station City Tarn Taran and in connection with the same, he along with other police officials including PHG Rakesh Kumar had gone to a factory namely Matharu Agro Industry for effecting the arrest of the accused persons in the aforesaid FIR and found that petitioner Harjinder Singh along with his sons Harpreet Singh and Manpreet Singh was also present there. The petitioner

along with his sons objected the police party from performing their official duty and in that process, first they entered into an altercation with complainant and other police officials and thereafter, they caused injuries on his head and backside. When PHG Rakesh Kumar intervened, they also torn his uniform and snatched his purse containing Rs. 4300/- by threatening to kill.

Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the case and in fact, no such incident has taken place.

Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that in fact the son of the petitioner, namely Harpreet Singh, has also been named in the FIR, though he has already died.

Learned State counsel has opposed the bail on the ground that the petitioner and his son have caused injuries to the police officials, who had gone to perform their official duties and in case, any leniency is shown and the petitioner is granted anticipatory bail, it will demoralize the police officials as there is no mala fide alleged by the petitioner against the police officials because they admittedly had gone to perform their duty for effecting the arrest of the accused persons in the aforesaid FIR.

Learned State counsel further submits that in fact the name of the son of the petitioner was wrongly mentioned, however, the same has now been corrected by registering a DDR in this regard.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties.

Without commenting anything on the merits of the case, considering the fact that the petitioner has caused injuries to the police

officials and has created obstruction in the performance of their official duties, this Court finds no ground to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

Petition stands dismissed.

07.08.2020

Waseem Ansari

(ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No