

105

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

**CRM-M-26970-2020 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 14.09.2020**

Onkar Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUDIP AHLUWALIA

Present: Mr. Rajvinder Singh Bains, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. B.S. Sewak, Additional A.G., Punjab.

Mr. Parambir Singh (Sunny), Advocate, and
Mr. Harpreet Singh (Rajan), Advocate,
for the complainant.

SUDIP AHLUWALIA, J. (ORAL)

CRM-22832-2020:

Ld. Counsel for the applicant/petitioner is permitted to place on record the documents, being Annexures P-6/T and P-7/T, which happen to be the representations submitted by the petitioner and his mother to the Commissioner of Police, Ludhiana.

Application stands disposed off.

CRM-M-26970-2020:

Seen the video clipping sent by Ld. Counsel for the complainant, which clearly goes to show the petitioner wearing a yellow turban. Admittedly, he is not seen to be carrying any weapon himself in this short video clipping of

57 seconds duration, but at the same time, it is crystal clear that the assault on the head of the complainant, who at the relevant time was wearing a grey T-shirt and shorts, was done brutally by some associate of the petitioner in the dead of the night and within his direct line of view. As such, the story made out by mother of the petitioner in the application subsequently submitted to the Commissioner of Police, Ludhiana (Annexure P-7/T) to the effect that the complainant had concocted a story after “self- inflicting injuries on himself” is *ex-facie* false.

2. Even in his own application, allegedly sent to the Commissioner of Police, Ludhiana (Annexure P-6/T), the petitioner specifically stated that the bone of his nose was broken by the complainant and his associates. However, his Medical Report issued from the Dayanand Medical College and Hospital, Ludhiana (Annexure P-4) does not mention anything about any such bone breakage/fracture, nor about the alleged loss of his vision from an eye.

3. In view of the aforesaid circumstances and considering that assault on the complainant, who is himself a Police Officer, had taken place at the night time, this is not a fit case to grant the extra ordinary protection by way of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4. Dismissed.

14.09.2020

Apurva

(SUDIP AHLUWALIA)
JUDGE

1. Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
2. Whether reportable: Yes/No