

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

CRM-M-35503-2020

Date of decision: November 03, 2020

Ravi Singh @ Sharry

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

Present: Mr. G.S. Kaura, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Joginder Pal Ratra, DAG, Punjab.

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J. (Oral)

This is the first petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.85 dated 8.7.2020 under Sections 307/34 IPC and Sections 25/27 of the Arms Act, registered at Police Station Baghapurana, District Moga.

Counsel for the petitioner submits that as per the allegations in the FIR, registered on the statement of Sahib Singh, that he received a phone call from an unknown number, the person on the other side was threatening him and in the meantime, the complainant called his brother-in-law Jaspal Singh, who also have a words with said person, who was extending threats.

Later on, when the complainant and his father were present in the house, two motorcycles came, on which Lovepreet @ Sunny, Kaku, Jasvir Singh @ Jassa and Sharry (the petitioner) came in front of their house

and started rebuking them. Thereafter, they fired four shots towards the complainant side to kill them but they saved their lives.

It is further stated in the FIR that the reason for the incident was that the sister of the complainant was doing a private job and Lovepreet @ Sunny was stalking her and the complainant and his family members were stopping him.

Counsel for the petitioner submits that Lovepreet Singh @ Sunny and Jasvir Singh @ Jassa stand arrested and released on regular bail. Counsel for the petitioner further submits that there is no direct attribution towards the petitioner.

In reply, the learned State counsel has, however, opposed the prayer on the ground that the petitioner is named in the FIR as one of the assailants and during the investigation, the main accused, namely, Lovepreet Singh @ Sunny has disclosed that the fire arms were in the custody of the petitioner and therefore, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required.

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

Therefore, the present petition stands dismissed.

November 03, 2020
satish

(ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN)
JUDGE