

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

204

CRM-M-32693-2020

Date of decision : 10.11.2020.

Parveen Kumar

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana

.. Respondent

CORAM :HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL

Present:- Mr. Sushil Bhardwaj, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Bhupender Singh, DAG, Haryana.

Anupinder Singh Grewal, J. (Oral)

Heard through video conferencing.

The petitioner is seeking anticipatory bail in FIR No. 1304 dated 27.12.2019, under Sections 120-B, 307 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, besides Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959, registered at Police Station Karnal Sadar, District Karnal.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that it is alleged in the FIR that two persons had caused injuries to the complainant and others. Two persons were identified as Lovepreet and Rahul and they have been arrested and recovery has been effected from them. The petitioner has been arraigned as an accused on the statement of co-accused.

Learned State counsel, however, contends that the presence of the petitioner was captured in the CCTV footage. He has drawn my attention to the affidavit dated 06.11.2020 filed by the Deputy Superintendent of Police, Karnal-II wherein it is stated that the petitioner was found to be present at the

place of occurrence along with co-accused Rahul and both of them had fired shots. He also contends that co-accused, namely, Lovepreet had allegedly accompanied the accused.

In view of the serious allegations of the petitioner having entered the shop of the complainant and fired shots at him and others, I do not deem it appropriate to grant the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Consequently, the petition stands dismissed.

However, it is clarified that nothing which has been observed hereinabove shall be deemed to have any bearing on the merits of the controversy.

(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

November 10, 2020
sonia gugnani

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