

102

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.34033 of 2020 (O&M)
Decided on: 27.10.2020

Sahil

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

Present:- Mr. Ketan Antil, 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.512 dated 09.09.2019 registered under Sections 148, 149, 307, 323, 506 IPC and 25 of the Arms Act, at Police Station City Sonapat, District Sonapat.

Counsel for the petitioner has submitted that as per the allegations in the FIR, the petitioner was, though, named in the FIR but no specific role is attributed to him and the fire-arm injury is attributed to co-accused Sillu, which hit the hand of Saurav, the friend of the complainant. Counsel for the petitioner has referred to the statement of Saurav to submit that no overt act is attributed towards the petitioner, however, counsel for the State has opposed the prayer for bail on the ground that the petitioner is named in the FIR and there are specific allegations that the persons who were accompanying Sillu caused injuries with danda, lathi, sword, etc. to the complainant and his friend.

CASE HEARD THROUGH VIDEO CONFERENCING

Even in the statement of Saurav, it is stated that the person accompanying Sillu, has caused injuries to Amit.

A perusal of the FIR further show that it is registered on 09.09.2019 and the petitioner is evading the arrest for the last more than 01 year whereas two of the co-accused of petitioner, who have been arrested, granted the concession of regular bail.

After hearing the counsel for the parties and considering the totality of circumstances and serious allegations against the petitioner, I find no ground to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

Dismissed.

(ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN)
JUDGE

27.10.2020
yakub

Whether speaking/reasoned Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No