

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

Sr. No.208-4

CRM-M-7171-2021

Date of decision: 02.12.2021

Rajdeep Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK SIBAL

Present: Mr. J.S. Thakur, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Gunkirat Kaur, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. B.S. Sidhu, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Divij Datt, Advocate
for the complainant.

* * *

DEEPAK SIBAL, J. (Oral)

The present petition has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for the grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.196, dated 13.11.2020, registered under Sections 307, 323, 324, 148, 149 IPC and Sections 201 IPC added later on at Police Station Cantt. Jalandhar, District Jalandhar Commissionerate.

Briefly stated, the case of the prosecution is that the petitioner and his co-accused, attacked the complainant's husband – Vikram which resulting in Vikram suffering five injuries on his person, three of which were caused by the petitioner. All the three injuries attributed to the petitioner were with a sharp edged weapon and on Vikram's head. Out of these injuries, one was declared to be dangerous to life. The other two injuries were on left side and on the back of Vikram's neck.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case; under the interim orders passed by this Court, he has already joined the investigation; investigation in this case is complete; the CCTV footage being relied upon by the prosecution has no evidentiary value as the same has not been sent for forensic examination and that since the case of the prosecution is that the assailants were having muffled faces there is no evidence to implicate the petitioner.

Learned State counsel as also learned Senior counsel appearing for the complainant oppose the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner on the ground that the petitioner faces another criminal case under the NDPS Act and yet another case under Section 174-A IPC. It is further submitted that the petitioner is the one who caused as many as three injuries on Vikram's head with a sharp edged weapon and one out of these injuries has been declared to be dangerous to life.

Including the present case for attempt to murder, the petitioner is presently facing three criminal cases. In one of the criminal case being faced by the petitioner, he has also been declared to be a proclaimed offender. Thus, not only is the petitioner a habitual offender but also has a history of violation of the conditions of bail and absconding from the process of justice.

Further, in the present case, the petitioner is alleged to have caused as many as three injuries on the Vikram's head with a sharp edged weapon and that one of these injuries has been declared to be dangerous to life.

The petitioner's identity has been disclosed by none other but the victim himself.

In the light of the above, in the opinion of this Court, the petitioner does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail.

Dismissed.

Nothing observed herein-above shall be considered to be an expression of opinion by this Court on the merits of the case.

December 02, 2021
Jyoti 1

(DEEPAK SIBAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No