

**In The High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana
At Chandigarh**

CRM-M-9772-2020 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 30.7.2021

Santosh Sahni and others Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Abhimanyu Singh, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Ms. Sheenu Sura, DAG, Haryana,
assisted by SI Jaswinder.

(Proceedings conducted through video conferencing)

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioners have approached this Court seeking grant of anticipatory bail in respect of a case registered against them vide FIR No.112, dated 15.4.2019, Police Station Yamuna Nagar Sadar, District Yamuna Nagar, under Section 302, 34 IPC.
2. The FIR in question was lodged at the instance of Munna Singh wherein it is alleged that his younger brother Muntun Singh was working in a ply-board factory since the last 2 years and was residing in a small house situated outside the factory. The complainant alleged that he came to know telephonically that his brother has been beaten up by Kanhaiya, Santosh Sahni and Nand Kishore with the help of

‘sticks’ and had inflicted blows on his head. Information received was further to the effect that one Rajesh Kumar had taken his brother in his car to Civil Hospital, Yamuna Nagar for treatment, but the complainant’s brother could not survive and succumbed to his injuries.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that it is virtually a case of blind murder inasmuch as the complainant had never seen the occurrence in question and it was only on the basis of telephonic information that the FIR came to be lodged. Learned counsel has submitted that in these circumstances the petitioners deserve the concession of anticipatory bail as in any case they are willing to cooperate with investigation.
4. Opposing the petition, learned State counsel has submitted that since the petitioners are specifically named in the FIR and are attributed injuries with the help of ‘sticks’ resulting in death of the deceased, no case for grant of anticipatory bail is made out.
5. I have considered rival submissions addressed before this Court.
6. Having regard to the nature of allegation wherein the petitioners are alleged to have caused injuries to the deceased leading to his death, no special case for grant of anticipatory bail is made out. The petition is sans any merit and is hereby dismissed.

30.7.2021

Mohan

(GURVINDER SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking /reasoned

Yes / No

Whether Reportable

Yes / No