

104

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.32895 of 2020 (O&M)

Decided on: 15.10.2020

Gurmeet

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

Present:- Mr. M.S. Kathuria, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sumit Jain, Addl. AG, Haryana.

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN J. (Oral)

Prayer in this petition is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.398 dated 26.07.2019 registered under Sections 148, 149, 323, 325, 326, 427, 506 IPC at Police Station City, District Yamuna Nagar.

Counsel for the petitioner has argued that as per the allegations in the FIR, registered at the instance of the complainant – Gagandeep Singh, it is stated that on 25.07.2019, he and his friend Vijay Kumar, were attacked by the accused party, in which they caused multiple injuries to the victims with their respective weapons. It is further submitted that the petitioner – Gurmeet was carrying a gandasi and gave the blow of the same to the victim – Gagandeep Singh on his right side of his forehead and the co-accused Bhavuk caused rod blow on the leg of the complainant.

Counsel for the petitioner has relied upon the order dated 09.01.2020 passed in CRM-M No.54276 of 2019, vide which one of the

CASE HEARD THROUGH VIDEO CONFERENCING

co-accused i.e. Bhavuk @ Rajat was granted the concession of regular bail.

Counsel for the petitioner has also relied upon the order dated 21.09.2020 passed in CRM-M No.27989 of 2020, vide which another co-accused of the petitioner namely Amarjeet Kumar @ Jodhi, was granted the concession of anticipatory bail. A perusal of the order show that he was not named in the FIR and he was nominated on the basis of the disclosure statement of Bhavuk @ Rajat, whose anticipatory bail stands dismissed.

A perusal of the record show that even the regular bail of Bhavuk was dismissed by this Court vide order dated 23.10.2019 passed in CRM-M No.44374 of 2019, noticing the fact that as many as 20 injuries were inflicted on the complainant and other victims.

Counsel for the State has opposed the prayer for bail on the ground that the petitioner is evading his arrest for the last 01 year and 03 months and is not allowing the police to complete the investigation.

After hearing the counsel for the parties, noticing the fact that the petitioner is specifically named in the FIR and attributed forehead injury on the victim, who has suffered multiple injuries, at the hands of the accused persons, therefore, I find no ground to grant the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

Dismissed.

(ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN)
JUDGE

15.10.2020

yakub

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable:

Yes/No