

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

**CRM-M-32442-2021 (O&M)
Decided on : 13.09.2021.**

(1.)

Titi Sharma @ Tribhawan Deep Sharma

....Petitioner

VS

State of Punjab

....Respondents

(2.)

CRM-M-33698-2021

Arshdeep Singh alias Lali

....Petitioner

VS

State of Punjab

....Respondents

(3.)

CRM-M-32731-2021

Jaslove Preet Singh Sidhu

....Petitioner

VS

State of Punjab

....Respondents

(4.)

CRM-M-32999-2021 (O&M)

Harmandeep Singh @ Harmandeep Singh Gill

....Petitioner

VS

State of Punjab

....Respondents

(5.)

CRM-M-28007-2021 (O&M)

Narinder Pal Singh Sidhu

....Petitioner

VS

State of Punjab

....Respondents

(6.)

CRM-M-32506-2021

Paramjit Singh alias Pamma and anr.

....Petitioners

VS

State of Punjab

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present :- Dr. Anmol Rattan Singh Sidhu, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Sukhcharan Singh, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Sandeep Kumar, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. A.P.S. Deol, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Vishal Rattan Lamba, Advocate for the complainant.

VIKAS BAHL, J.

The present order would dispose of six petitions filed by 7 accused persons in FIR No.17 dated 10.02.2021 under Sections 302, 323, 188, 120-B IPC, registered at Police Station, Moga, District Moga.

Titi Sharma @ Tribhawan Deep Sharma has filed CRM-M-32442-

2021 for anticipatory bail (case No.1), Arshdeep Singh @ Lali has filed

CRM-M-33698-2021 for anticipatory bail (case No.2), Jaslovepreet Singh Sidhu has filed CRM-M-32731-2021 for anticipatory bail (case No.3), Harmandeep Singh @ Harmandeep Singh Gill has filed CRM-M-32999-2021 for anticipatory bail (case No.4), Narinder Pal Singh Sidhu has filed CRM-M-28007-2021 for regular bail (case No.5) and Paramjit Singh @ Pamma and Gurpreet Singh @ Gopi have together filed CRM-M-32506-2021 for regular bail (case No.6). In all the aforesaid cases, the FIR and the other documents are similar, however, learned counsel for the parties have argued from CRM-M-32442-2021(case no.1) which has been taken as the lead case.

FIR No.0017 dated 10.02.2021 was registered on the statement of Gurtej Singh who had stated that at around 7.30 hours in the evening, he along with Chamkaur Singh were campaigning in favour of his wife Kulwinder Kaur who was contesting the election for Municipal Committee when their opponents Narinder Pal Singh Sidhu (petitioner in case No.5), whose wife Paramjeet Kaur Sidhu was also contesting against Kulwinder Kaur, came in a Pajero Sports SUV, white colour bearing no. PB10-DZ-9597, which was driven by the said Narinder Pal Singh Sidhu himself and along with him was Jasmail @ Nikku and in the rear part of the said vehicle both nephews of Jasmail @ Nikku were sitting. In the second car i.e. Bolero vehicle bearing no.PB-65-M-3724 which was driven by Jaslovepreet Singh Sidhu (petitioner in case No.3), his brother was sitting alongside whereas on the back seat, Paramjit Singh @ Pamma (petitioner No.1 in case No.6) and two unknown persons were sitting. The third vehicle i.e. a black Scorpio bearing no.PB-05-AJ-0061, was being driven by an unknown person and in the front seat Titi Sharma @ Tribhawan Deep Sharma (petitioner in case No.1) was sitting and on the rear seat, three unknown persons were sitting.

In the fourth car which was a Fortuner, one Happy and some unidentified persons were sitting. In the FIR it has further been stated that the said persons were creating hooliganism and when the complainant party which also consisted of Jagdeep Singh @ Bhola (deceased) and Harminder Singh @ Babbu (deceased) tried stopping them from creating hooliganism then the said persons came in rage and with an intention to kill drove their vehicle, as a result of which Harminder Singh died on the spot and Jagdeep Singh @ Bhola was referred to DMC, Ludhiana where later on, he also died.

In the present case, a supplementary statement of the said complainant Gurtej Singh was recorded on 12.02.2021 i.e. after two days of the registration of the above said FIR. In the said supplementary statement, complainant Gurtej Singh improved his version and stated that many of the accomplices were having baseball bats and batons in their vehicles and some persons started hitting the complainant party with baseball bats and Arshdeep Singh @ Lali (petitioner in case No.2) attacked Harminder Singh @ Babbu with a baseball bat on the back of his head and sat in the vehicle afterwards. Thereafter, challan was submitted in the present case. Subsequently, an application was moved by the prosecution to conduct further investigation in the said case. The Chief Judicial Magistrate, Moga vide order dated 23.03.2021, which is annexed as Annexure P-7 along with the petition, keeping in view the provisions of Section 173 (8) Cr.P.C., allowed the application and permitted the prosecution to conduct further investigation in the above said FIR. In pursuance of the said order, a detailed report was prepared by the Special Investigation Team (SIT) which has been annexed with the petition as Annexure P-8. The said SIT consisted of Superintendent of Police, Moga, Deputy Superintendent of Police (Crime Against Women and Children), Moga and Incharge Cyber Cell, Moga and

after visiting the spot and recording the statement of the complainant as well as other witnesses including ASI Jaswant Singh, came to the conclusion that Narinder Pal Singh Sidhu (petitioner in case No.5) has a rod inserted in his left leg and ankle of his right leg was locked and, thus, was unfit to drive the vehicle and at the time of the incident he was found sitting on the front seat of the Pajero car and the said vehicle was being driven by one Jasmail Singh. It was further found that a huge crowd had gathered which had vandalized the cars of the accused party and broke the front and rear glass of the same. It was further found that on account of the above, the accused party including the petitioners tried to escape from the place of occurrence in their vehicles and since the vehicles were driven very fast, in the process they hit the deceased and the injured persons, causing them injuries. Further, medical opinion was taken and as per the same, it was stated that with respect to the injuries caused to the deceased Harminder Singh, the possibility of the same having been caused on account of fall could not be ruled out. It was also found that in the present case Section 302 IPC was not made out whereas, Section 304 IPC was made out. The relevant portion of the report of the SIT is reproduced hereinbelow:-

*“Special Investigation Team summoned both the parties related with the case to join investigation proceedings with their proofs. Whereby **complainant of the case Gurtej Singh alias Raju** Kular S/o Hardev Singh Kular R/o House Number 2158 Shaheed Bhagat Singh Nagar Moga and Paramjit Kaur W/o Narinderpal Singh S/o Harbans R/o Ward Number 07 Shaheed Bhagat Singh Nagar, Moga, Gupreet Singh S/o Hardayal Singh R/o Shaheed Bhagat Singh Nagar Moga, Jaspal Singh S/o Dayal Singh S/o Hajara Singh R/o Kacha Dusanjh Road Shaheed Bhagat*

Singh Nagar Moga, Ashwani Kumar S/o Krishan Lal, Baljinder Singh S/o Gurdev Singh, Gupreet Singh S/o Jaspal Singh, Gurcharan Singh S/o Harnek Singh, Harbhajan Singh S/o Bur Singh, Angrej Raj S/o Sh. Ram, Navtej Singh S/o Gurbachan Singh, Captain Baldev Singh S/o Hardit Singh, Kulwant Singh S/o Gurnam Singh residents of Shaheed Bhagat Singh Nagar Moga of the applicant party came present. They were made to join investigation proceeding investigation regarding the case was conducted and statements were recorded. Apart from that A.S.I. Jaswant Singh Number 17/ Moga Police Post Balkhandi Police Station Kot Isse Khan was made to join investigation proceeding statement was recorded. That all the statements are attached for examination.

CONCLUSION REPORT:- Till date secret and notified investigation conducted by Special Investigation Team, it transpired that the applicant Paramjit Kaur and her husband Narinderpal Singh Sidhu are Ex-Councillor, during Municipal Council Election 2021 applicant Paramjit Kaur was the candidate from Congress Party from Ward Number 9, Daughter-in-law of the applicant Harmeet Kaur Sidhu W/o Jaslovepreet Singh was independent candidate from Ward Number 7, from the opposite party of the applicant Paramjit Kaur from Akali Dal (Badal) Kulwinder Kaur W/o Gurtej Singh Kular R/o Shaheed Bhagat Singh Nagar Moga was the candidate on dated 09.02.2021 husband of candidate from Shiromani Akali Dal Badal Kulwinder Kaur complainant of the case Gurtej Singh along with his fellows was doing campaigning at Kacha Dusanjh Road Moga then

husband of candidate of Congress party Paramjit Kaur namely Narinderpal Singh Sidhu also along with his fellows by boarding different vehicles came near to them itself at Kacha Dusanjh Road Moga and started accusing the complainant of the case party regarding distributing liquor to the voters, Narinderpal Singh Sidhu in this regard also called A.S.I. Jaswant Singh Incharge Police Post Focal Point Moga at the spot, who came to the spot within 5-7 minutes itself, who reached the spot and tried to exhort both the parties but both the parties and their supporters were in large numbers were arguing with each other and were abusing each other, **during this arguments some unknown persons started vandalizing the Bolero vehicle of Narinder Pal Singh Sidhu Party bearing Number PB-65-M-3724 which was driven by Jaslovepreet Singh S/o Narinderpal Singh Sidhu and broken front and rear glass of the Bolero vehicle, thereafter Narinderpal Singh Sidhu party sped away their vehicles momentarily, at the time of speeding away the vehicles Jasdeep Singh alias Bhola S/o Pritam Singh R/o Tarewala and Harminster Singh alias Babbu S/o Ujagar Singh R/o Shaheed Bhagat Singh Nagar Moga, complainant of the case Gurtej Singh and Malkit Singh s/o Gurdeep Singh R/o Deep Singh Wala got injured, out of the injured Harminster Singh alias Babbu died at Civil Hospital Moga and Jasdeep Singh alias Bhola died at D.M.C. Ludhiana.**

FACTS THAT HAVE COME TO FORE DURING INVESTIGATION:-

1. Since injury was inflicted upon the left leg of Narinderpal Singh Sidhu, rod has been inserted in his left leg and since ankle

of right leg being locked Narinderpal Singh Sidhu being unfit could not drive the vehicle. At the time of incidence Narinderpal Singh Sidhu was found sitting on the front conductor seat in Pajero vehicle Number PB-10DZ-9597. This vehicle was found driven by Jasmel Singh alias Nikku S/o Harbans Singh R/s Shaheed Bhagat Singh Nagar Moga.

2. At the spot since there was gathering of huge crowd some unknown impish aliments started vandalizing Bolero vehicle PB-65-M-3724 of Narinderpal Singh Sidhu which was driven by Jaslovepreet Singh S/o Narinderpal Singh Sidhu and broken front and rear glass of the Bolero.

3. During this avulsion Narinderpal Singh Sidhu and his fellows Jasmel Singh alias Nikku sped away Pajero vehicle Number PB-10-DZ-9597, Jaslovepreet Singh Bolero vehicle PB-65-M-3724 and their rest of the fellows sped away their vehicles.

4. Since speeding away of the vehicle at high speeding Jasdeep Singh alias Bhola S/o Pritam Singh R/o Tarewala and Harminder Singh alias Babbu S/o Ujagar Singh R/o Shaheed Bhagat Singh Nagar Moga, complainant of the case Gurtej Singh and Malkit Singh S/o Gurpreet Singh R/o Deep Singh Wala, present at the spot, got injured. Out of the injured Harminder Singh alias Babbu died at Civil Hospital Moga and Jasdeep Singh alias Bhola died at D.M.C. Ludhiana.

5. The complainant of the case has recorded in his preliminary statement that due to regarding speeding away of vehicle his fellows got injured. Whereas during investigation on dated 12.02.2021 the complainant of the case has recorded in his

supplementary statement that when they were inhibiting Narinderpal Singh Sidhu and his fellows from doing hooliganism. Narinderpal Singh Sidhu said to his fellows that run over the vehicles upon them and kill them and then some persons who were carrying baseballs, started hitting the complainant and his fellows with baseball. Arshdeep Singh alias Lali attached Harminder Singh alias Babbu with baseball on the back of his head and sat in a vehicle by rushing there. All the accused persons with an intention to kill run over their respective vehicles upon the complainant and his fellows.

In this regard it is joint opinion of Special Investigation Team that on the one hand the complainant of the case is saying about running over the vehicles upon them, whereas on the other hand is saying assault with baseball. At the time of incidence alighting from running vehicle and then sitting in the vehicle by rushing by attacking with baseball is impossible. In concern of injuries inflicted by Harminder Singh medical opinion has been obtained. In concern of injuries suffered by Harminder Singh the Doctor has written that, "The injuries of Harminder Singh S/o Ujagar Singh wide PMR No.JK/01/21 Dt. the possibility of injuries caused by fall cannot be ruled out."

Circumstances of the investigation and according to the circumstances of the spot during investigation conducted by Special Investigation Team it has transpired from the facts that have come to fore that injuries suffered by Harinder Singh alias Babbu were not inflicted by anyone. Rather these injuries have been found inflicted due to hitting of fate of the vehicle and falling

down.

6. *Injuries have been inflicted to the complainant of the case and his fellows Jasdeep Singh alias Bhola S/o Pritam Singh R/o Tarewala, Harminder Singh alias Babbu S/o Ujagar Singh R/o Shaheed Bhagat Singh Nagar Moga and Malkit Singh S/o Gurdeep Singh R/o Deep Singh Wala, due to hitting of high speed vehicles and it has found that out of the injured death of Harminder Singh alias Babbu and Jasdeep Singh alias Bhola has taken place.*

7. *It has been found that Narinderpal Singh Sidhu was not driving Pajero vehicle himself. But due to the avulsion of the vehicles itself the drivers had sped away the vehicles. As a result of which Pajero Vehicle PB-10-DZ-9597, which has been found driven by Jasmel Singh alias Nikku and Bolero Vehicle PB-65-M-3724 which has been found driven by Jaslovepreet Singh, due to hitting of fate of these vehicles and vehicles came along with Narinderpal Singh Sidhu this incidence has found occurred.*

According to all the above mentioned facts during investigation conducted by Special Investigation Team it transpired that during the election campaign of Municipal Council Moga Elections Narinderpal Singh Sidhu upon asking by someone that Liquor is being distributed at Kacha Dusanjh Road Moga his opponent party (Complainant of the case). Narinderpal Singh Sidhu along with his fellows had come to Kacha Dusanjh Road Moga where lot of crowd was gathered, out of the crowd someone started vandalizing glasses of the Bolero vehicle of fellow of Narinderpal Singh Sidhu, at the spot

after vandalizing the Bolero vehicle Narinderpal Singh Sidhu and his fellows due to speeding away the vehicles this incidence has caused, therefore, in the present case instead of section 302 I.P.C. section 304 of I.P.C. is made out.

Report is submitted for approval, please.

<i>Sd/-</i>	<i>Sd/-</i>	<i>Sd/-</i>
<i>S.I. Navneet Kuar</i>	<i>Lakhwinder Singh</i>	<i>Jagatpreet Singh,</i>
<i>Incharge</i>	<i>P.P.S.</i>	<i>P.P.S.</i>
<i>Cyber Cell Moga</i>	<i>Deputy</i>	<i>Superintendent of</i>
	<i>Superintendent of</i>	<i>Police (Investigation)</i>
	<i>Police, Crime against Women</i>	<i>Moga</i>
	<i>and Child Moga</i>	<i>”</i>

That the SHO, Police Station City Moga vide application dated 12.06.2021 submitted the said report along with the challan. It has been stated in the application dated 12.06.2021 (Annexure P-9) that the SSP, Moga had ordered to discuss the matter with DA (Legal) wherein DA (Legal) had mentioned that since the challan has been filed before the Court and the further investigation had been carried out on the orders of the Court itself, it would be appropriate to submit the report of the SIT to the Court and thus, the said report was attached and was produced before the Additional Sessions Judge, Moga.

Learned Senior counsel for the petitioner has submitted that in the present case, as per the version given in the FIR no injury with any weapon is stated to be caused by any person and moreso, as per the FIR, the injuries have been stated to have been caused by the accused party by driving their cars on the deceased/injured person. It is further submitted that the supplementary statement of the Complainant, which has been recorded after

two days, is an afterthought and the injury attributed to Arshdeep Singh @ Lali (petitioner in case No.2) with a baseball bat, is only to implicate him in the case inasmuch as it is impossible to imagine that from a speeding car, the said Arshdeep Singh @ Lali would come out and give injury with a baseball bat and then again sit in the car moreso, when the crowd had been gathered and the accused party including the Petitioners were trying to escape. Strong reliance has been placed upon the order dated 23.03.2021 vide which further investigation was ordered by the Court of Chief Judicial Magistrate and also on the report dated 04.05.2021 by virtue of which it was found after recording the statement of the complainant, the accused party as well as ASI Jaswant Singh, that since large number of persons had started breaking the vehicles of the petitioners, the petitioners tried to escape in their vehicles and in the process the deceased/injured person had suffered injuries. It is further highlighted that Narinder Pal Singh Sidhu (petitioner in case No.5) had a rod in his left leg and his ankle of the right leg is locked and thus, could not have possibly driven the car. Reference has also been made to photographs and pen drive which has been annexed as Annexure P-10, to show that the front glass of the vehicles of the accused person has been damaged and that there are large number of persons surrounding the said vehicles. Learned Senior counsel for the petitioner has further pointed out that it is not that the petitioners, who have applied for anticipatory bail were absconding, inasmuch as the petitioners had applied for anticipatory bail before the Additional Sessions Judge, Moga which was dismissed on 02.08.2021/03.08.2021 and thereafter, had immediately approached this Court. Learned Senior counsel for the petitioner has further referred to the alleged injuries caused to the two injured persons, i.e. Gurtej and Malkiat.

The relevant portion of the MLR of Gurtej, (annexed as Annexure P-3) dated

09.02.2021 who is alleged to have suffered four injuries, is reproduced hereinbelow:-

“(1) Abrasion 2x2 cm present over ® knee. Fresh bleeding present.

(2) Abrasion 1x1 cm present over (L) knee. Fresh bleeding present.

(3) Abrasion 3x2 cm present over (L) elbow region. Fresh bleeding present.

(4) Patient C/o pain in middle of chest region. Adv X-ray

Sd/-09/02/2021.”

It is submitted that three of the injuries are abrasions and one is only pain in the chest and all the said injuries have been declared to be simple. Reference has also been made to the injuries caused to the second injured Malkiat and the relevant portion of his MLR is reproduced hereinbelow:-

“(1) Patient C/o pain over ® shoulder, Movements painful. Adv. X-ray.

(2) Patient C/o Pain over ® elbow region. Movements painful. Adv. X-ray.

(3) Patient C/o pain over ® wrist. Movements painful. Adv. X-ray.

(4) Red Abrasion 1x1 cm present over xxxx of ® hand.

(5) Red Abrasion 3x0.5 cm present over (L) writ.

(6) Red Abrasion 1x1 cm present over (L) thumb.

(7) Red Abrasion 2x0.5 cm present above ® knee.

Sd/- 09/02/2021.”

It has been argued that all the aforesaid injuries are also simple.

Further, it has been argued that the alleged 15 injuries to the person of the

deceased i.e. Jasdeep @ Bholla, would show that the same have been caused on account of vehicles hitting the said deceased and with respect to the two injuries caused to the deceased, Harminder Singh, it has been stated that injury no.1 is only an abrasion and injury no.2 as per the investigation of the SIT, could be because of a fall. Learned Senior Counsel has also submitted that in case the accused persons, including the Petitioners, had an intention to kill then they would have attacked Gurtej Singh as it was his wife who was contesting the elections. It is further submitted that the petitioners are not criminals and belong to respectable families.

Learned Senior counsel has prayed for allowing of all the petitions and has made detailed submissions with respect to every petitioner.

On the other hand, learned Senior counsel for the complainant has submitted that in the present case in the FIR, it has specifically been stated that the accused persons with an intention to kill have driven their vehicles as a result of which two persons have died and two persons have received injuries. Reference has been made to the said injuries suffered. The post mortem report of the deceased Jasdeep Singh has been referred to and it has been stated there were 15 injuries on his person. The relevant portion of the post mortem report which has been annexed as Annexure R-2/1 is reproduced hereinbelow:-

Sr. No.	Injuries
1.	MULTIPAL BRUISES ON RIGHT ELBOW JOINT WITH FRACTURE OF UNDERLINE BONE ULNA.
2.	FRACTURE OF DISTAL HUMERUS ON RIGHT SIDE
3.	MULTIPLE BRUISES ON LEFT WRIT JOINT WITH FRACTURE OF UNDERLINE DISTAL HUMERUS
4.	ABRASION ON LEFT KNEE
5.	MULTIPLE ABRASION ON RIGHT HAND
6.	MULTIPLE ABRASION ON LEFT HAND
7.	BRUISE 8X5 CM ON LEFT CHEST WALL POSTEROLATERAL SIDE ALSO 7X10 CM BRUISE AT ANTERIOR CHEST WALL EXTENDING FROM LEFT NIPPLE TO RIGHT NIPPLE
8.	ON DISSECTION FRACTURE OF 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 RIBS ON RIGHT SIDE ALONG WITH LACERATIONS OF LUNG ON RIGHT SIDE
9.	FRACTURE OF 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 RIBS ON LEFT SIDE ALONG WITH LACERATIONS OF LUNG ON LEFT SIDE
10.	LW ON HEART AT RIGHT ATRIUM AND RIGHT VENTRICLE
11.	PLEURAL CAVITY FILLED WITH CLOTTED BLOOD

12.	PERITONEAL CAVITY FILLED WITH CLOTTED BLOOD
13.	MULTIPLE LACERATIONS ON LIVER
14.	ABRASION ON RIGHT KNEE
15.	SPLEEN PUNCTURED

Further reference has also been made to the injuries suffered by deceased Harminder Singh, which are two in number. The same are reproduced hereinbelow:-

Sr. No.	Remark
1.	Abrasion 3x1 cm present over the right cheek just below lower eyelid.
2.	Swelling present over the occipital region of skull of size 10x10 cm. On dissection, skull opened, xxxx haematoma present over occipital region, contusions present over occipital lobe of brain. Clotted blood present in sulci and gyri. Brain is oedematous.

Moreover the opinion of the doctor leading to the cause of death, which is also mentioned in Annexure R2/1, is also reproduced hereinbelow:-

“OPINION

Cause of Death:-

The cause of death in this case in my opinion is due to injury to the vital organ i.e. brain due to traumatic brain injury which is antemortem in nature and sufficient to cause death in due course of events.”

It has been submitted that in the supplementary statement specific attribution has been made to Arshdeep Singh @ Lali (Petitioner in case No.2) of his having caused injury no.2 to the deceased Harminder Singh. It has also been argued that the report dated 04.05.2021 cannot be relied upon and for the said purpose, the judgment of the Hon’ble Apex Court in Kaptan Singh Vs. State of M.P reported as 1997 (6) SCC 185 and in Dalip Singh Vs. State of Punjab reported as 1997 (11) SCC 573 have been relied upon. It has

further been argued that the said report cannot be read as the same is beyond the version given by the eye-witness/injured witnesses. It has also been argued that in the present case, non-bailable warrants were issued on 15.06.2021 and thereafter, even proclamation was issued and the petitioners Jaslovepreet Singh Sidhu (petitioner in case No.3), Titi Sharma @ Tribhawan Deep Sharma (petitioner in case No.1), Harmandeep Singh @ Harmandeep Singh Gill (petitioner in case No.4) and Arshdeep Singh @ Lali (petitioner in case No.2) would be declared proclaimed offenders on 13.09.2021 and it is only after the said proceedings had been initiated that the aforesaid persons had applied for anticipatory bail before the Additional Sessions Judge. It has further been submitted that the observations in the report dated 04.05.2021 to the effect that with respect to the injuries of Harminder Singh, the possibility of the same having been caused by a fall cannot be ruled out is absolutely incorrect inasmuch as one of the injuries suffered by the said Harminder Singh is on the brain. It has been argued that the incident has taken place in front of the house of the complainant party and no injury has been received by the accused party. Learned Senior Counsel has also referred to the challan in support of his contentions. Learned Senior counsel has vehemently opposed the bail applications of all the petitioners.

Learned State counsel has also opposed the bail applications of all the petitioners and has argued on the same lines as the argument of the Senior Counsel for the complainant.

This Court has heard learned counsel for the parties.

The following chart would give the details of the attribution against each of the petitioners:-

Case Title	Case Type	Allegation as per the FIR/supplementary statement/SIT Report
Titi Sharma @ Tribhawandeep Sharma Vs. State of Punjab [CRM-M-32442-2021]	Anticipatory bail	Sitting on the front seat of Scorpio bearing no. PB-05-AJ-0061. Same role as per the FIR/supplementary statement/SIT report.
Arshdeep Singh @ Lalli Vs. State of Punjab [CRM-M-33698-2021]	Anticipatory bail	Co-occupant of Bolero car bearing no.PB-65-M-3724. No specific attribution (as per the FIR). Injury given on the head of Harminder Singh with a baseball bat (as per the supplementary statement). Injury to Harminder Singh could be on account of fall and thus, not attributed to him (as per the SIT report).
Jaslovepreet Singh Sidhu Vs. State of Punjab [CRM-M-32731-2021]	Anticipatory bail	Driver of Bolero car bearing no.PB-65-M-3724 (both as per the FIR and SIT report).
Harmandeep Singh @ Harmandeep Singh Gill Vs. State of Punjab [CRM-M-32999-2021]	Anticipatory bail	Sitting on the back seat of Pajero car bearing no. PB-10-DZ-9597. No specific injury attributed to him (both as per the FIR and SIT report).
Narinder Pal Singh Sidhu Vs. State of Punjab [CRM-M-28007-2021]	Regular bail	Driver of Pajero car bearing No.PB-10-DZ-9597 (as per the FIR). However, as per the SIT report, he had a rod inserted inside his left leg and his ankle of right leg was locked, and thus, he could not and was not driving the vehicle. [In custody since 10.02.2021]

Paramjeet Singh @ Pamma [CRM-M-32506-2021]	Regular bail	Sitting on the back seat of Bolero . No specific injury attributed to him (both as per FIR and SIT report). [In custody since 10.02.2021.]
Gurpreet Singh @ Gopi [CRM-M-32506-2021]	Regular bail	Sitting on the back seat of Pajero car. No specific injury attributed (both as per FIR and SIT report). [In custody since 12.02.2021]

That before adverting to the specific case of each petitioner, it would be relevant to state that as per the FIR, the allegation was that the accused party including the petitioners have hit their cars and ran over the deceased (Har minder and Jasdeep) and injured persons (Malkiat Singh and Gurtej Singh), with an intention to kill them. In the FIR, there is no specific attribution of any injury caused by any of the accused much less, the petitioners with any weapon. In the supplementary statement recorded on 12.02.2021 i.e. after two days of the FIR, specific attribution has been made against Arshdeep Singh @ Lali (petitioner in case No.2) to the effect that he had given a baseball bat injury on the head of the deceased Har minder Singh. A perusal of the challan would show that the Pajero car as well as the Bolero car have been taken into police custody. Vide order dated 23.03.2021, the Chief Judicial Magistrate, Moga had on an application moved by the prosecution, by taking into consideration the provision of Section 173 (8) Cr.P.C., had permitted to conduct further investigation. The relevant portion of the said order is reproduced hereinbelow:-

“Heard. Section 173 Cr.P.C. empowers the Police Officers conducting investigation to file a report on completion of the investigation with the Magistrate empowered to take cognizance of the offence. Section 173 (8) Cr.P.C. empowers the office-in-charge to conduct further investigation even after filing

of a report under Section 173 (2) Cr.P.C., if he obtains further evidence, oral or documentary. Thus, the power of the Police Officer under Section 173 (8) Cr.P.C. is unrestricted. It has been so stated in **Rama Chaudhary Vs. State of Bihar 2009 (2) RCR (Criminal) 570:2009 (2) Recent Apex Judgments (R.A.J.) 675 : (2009) 6 SCC 346. In Vinay Tyagi Vs. Irshad Ali, 2013 (2) R.C.R. (Criminal) 197: 2013 (2) Recent Apex Judgments (R.A.J.) 69: (2013) 5 SCC 762,** wherein a two-Judge Bench, after referring to the decision in **Bhagwant Singh Vs. Commr. Of Police, 1985 (2) R.C.R. (Criminal) 259 : (1985) 2 SCC 537** has held that “However, having given our considered thought to the principles stated in these judgments, we are of the view that the Magistrate before whom a report under Section 173 (2) of the Code is filed, is empowered in law to direct “further investigation” and require the police to submit a further or a supplementary report. A three-Judge Bench of this court in *Bhagwant Singh* has, in no uncertain terms stated that principle, as aforementioned.” The position that emerges is that Section permission but the requirement of seeking prior leave of the Court to conduct further investigation and/or file a supplementary report will have to be read into and it is a necessary implication of the provisions of Section 173 (8) Cr.P.C. of the Code. In *Iqbal Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab and others (P&H) (D.B.): Law Finder Doc Id # 120525*, it has been held that “Criminal Procedure Code, 1973 Sections 173 (2) and 178 (3) Police conducting investigation into an offence and submitting report to Court under Section 173 (2) after completion of investigation

police can make further investigation when fresh facts came into notice. It would ordinarily be desirable that the police should inform the Court and seek formal permission to make over investigation when fresh facts come to light.”

Accordingly, in view of above discussion, present application in hand is hereby allowed and prosecution is permitted to conduct further investigation in the above said FIR. Papers be attached with the main file. Copy of this order be forwarded to concerned SHO.

*(Amandeep Kaur Chahal), PCS,
Chief Judicial Magistrate,
Moga / (U.I.D. No.PB0248)
(Direct Dictation)*

Date of order:23.03.2021”

In pursuance of the said order, a detailed report dated 04.05.2021 by the SIT consisting of 3 senior police officials was prepared. The relevant portion of the report has already been reproduced hereinabove. A perusal of the report would show that the spot was examined by the SIT and the statement of the complainant, the accused party as well as ASI Jaswant Singh was recorded and ultimately, it was found that Narinder Pal Singh Sidhu (petitioner in case No.5) had a rod inserted in his left leg and his right ankle was locked and thus, could not have driven the vehicle and in fact, the said vehicle was being driven by Jasmail Singh (not petitioner herein). It was also found on the basis of doctor's opinion that the possibility of injuries suffered by Harminder Singh could be as a result of a fall and that the said injuries were not afflicted by anyone. As per the said report, it was found that ASI Jaswant Singh, In Charge Police Post, Focal Point Moga, had

reached the spot within 5-7 minutes and had tried to stop both the parties and their supporters from arguing and abusing each other, when in the meantime, some unknown persons started vandalizing the Bolero vehicle of the accused party and even broke the front and rear glass of the aforesaid Bolero vehicle and thereafter, the accused party tried to speed away in their vehicles and in the said process, four persons were injured, out of which two died. The case was found to be a case of Section 304 IPC and not Section 302 IPC by the SIT. The said report of the SIT has been submitted by the SHO, Police Station, City Moga along with the challan.

Before proceeding further, it would be necessary to consider the objection raised by the learned Senior counsel for the complainant with respect to the petitioners placing reliance upon the report of the SIT. The first case relied upon by the Learned Senior Counsel in this regard is that of Dalip Singh (supra). In the case of Dalip Singh (supra) the trial had been conducted and had ended in conviction and it was in appeal therefrom that the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court was passed. In the said case, the conviction was after recording the entire evidence. It was observed in the said judgment that as many as 09 witnesses had been examined by the prosecution and 07 witnesses were examined by the defence and the designated Court had accepted the case of the prosecution in preference to that of the defence and passed the impugned order of conviction and sentence. It is in the said background that it was observed that the case diary prepared by the Investigating Officer would not be legally admissible and the legal evidence on the basis of which final judgment can be passed is the evidence which is adduced during trial and not the material collected during investigation. It was observed that the Court verdict regarding guilt or innocence of the accused would depend upon the evidence of the witnesses.

In the present case, the trial is yet to start. Admittedly, none of the witnesses have been examined and, thus, for the purpose of grant or refusal of bail, the said report of the SIT, by virtue of which further investigation has been carried out after the application of prosecution had been allowed vide Order dated 23.03.2021 and further investigation was permitted by the Chief Judicial Magistrate, Moga, can be taken into consideration. Moreover, the said investigation has been done by three senior police officials. Similarly, in Kaptan Singh's case (supra), the trial Court had acquitted the accused persons and the High Court had allowed the revision petition and had set aside the acquittal and had remanded the case back for fresh decision after hearing the parties. It is in the said background that the Hon'ble Apex Court had observed that the acquittal could not be primarily based upon the evidence of Inspector of CID who deposed that the story as made out by the prosecution was not true. In the said case, in fact the Magistrate had ignored the said report and had taken cognizance of the offences. In the present case, the trial Court has yet to consider the challan/SIT report, thus, it would be premature to reject the said report moreso, while deciding the present bail applications.

Thus, before this Court there are three versions from the side of the prosecution/investigation which are required to be considered. The first version is given in the FIR as per which the injuries were caused with the vehicles being driven by accused persons with an intention to kill. No specific injury with any weapon has been attributed to any person named in the FIR. In the supplementary statement of the Complainant, recorded after two days of the FIR, specific attribution to Arshdeep @ Lali (petitioner in case no.2) with a baseball bat has been made in addition to the allegations made in the FIR. Thus, the second version is a reiteration of the version in

the FIR with improvements. In the investigation carried out by three senior police officials, a case of two groups fighting has come to the fore out of which, when one group i.e the accused party tried to run away in their car, after their cars were damaged, and in the process caused injuries to four persons. The injuries, as are reproduced hereinabove being caused by vehicles is highly probable. The aspect that no serious injury has been caused to Gurtej Singh, whose wife was contesting the election, as he had only suffered abrasions/pain would be a point leaning in favour of the accused party, showing that in case they had a predetermined intention to kill, then in all likelihood, they would have attacked Gurtej Singh. This Court does not wish to give any final opinion on the said aspect as the same would be a matter of trial. Although, Arshdeep Singh @ Lali, Jaslovepreet Singh Sidhu, Harmandeep Singh and Titi Sharma have applied for anticipatory bail after some delay but it has to be kept in view that after the supplementary statement dated 12.02.2021, Order dated 23.03.2021 was passed by the Chief Judicial Magistrate allowing further investigation and the SIT had compiled the investigation report on 04.05.2021 finding the incident to be not as per the FIR/Supplementary statement and the same was submitted vide Application dated 12.06.2021 and at any rate, the said persons had applied for anticipatory bail which was dismissed by the Session Judge vide orders dated 2.08.2021/03.08.2021 and immediately thereafter the said persons have filed the present petitions and even as per the stand of the State and the complainant, the said persons, have not yet been declared as Proclaimed Offenders and thus, their cases deserve to be considered on merits.

This Court is of the view that the accused persons/petitioners who were driving the car cannot be treated equally with the persons who were sitting in

the vehicle. With the above background, this Court would like to deal with the case of each petitioner separately.

1. Arshdeep Singh @ Lali (petitioner in case No.2 CRM-M-33698-2021):-

The aforesaid petitioner has sought anticipatory bail. Learned senior counsel for the petitioner has vehemently stated that the said petitioner has not been attributed any injury as per the FIR and he has been attributed an injury with the baseball bat on the head of the deceased Harminder Singh in the supplementary statement which was recorded after two days of the FIR and was clearly an afterthought. It has further been submitted that as per the report of the SIT, the medical opinion was taken and it was observed that the said injury could be as a result of a fall. It has been argued that as per the FIR the said Arshdeep Singh @ Lalli was only a co-occupant of Bolero car bearing no.PB-65-M-3724.

On the other hand, learned Senior counsel for the complainant as well as the State have submitted that in the supplementary statement dated 12.02.2021, the fatal blow to Harminder Singh (deceased) has been attributed to the said Arshdeep Singh alias Lali. It is also argued that a perusal of the injury no.2 caused to the deceased, which has been reproduced hereinabove, could not be on account of a fall as there was a swelling present over the occipital region of the skull of size 10x10 cm and the cause of death is also due to fatal injury on the vital organ i.e. the brain. Keeping in view the specific attribution to Arshdeep Singh alias Lali, although the same is in the supplementary statement, this Court finds that he does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail and, thus, the present petition is dismissed.

However, nothing stated above shall be construed as a final

expression of opinion on the merits of the case and the trial would proceed independently of the observations made in the present case which are only for the purpose of adjudicating the present bail application.

2. Jaslovepreet Singh Sidhu (petitioner in case No.3 CRM-M-32731-2021).

The aforesaid Petitioner has sought Anticipatory Bail.

The allegation against this petitioner namely, Jaslovepreet Singh Sidhu, is that he was the driver of Bolero car bearing no.PB-65-M-3724. The said fact is apparent from the FIR as well as the SIT report. Learned Senior counsel for the petitioner has submitted that as per the SIT report, on account of a huge crowd having been gathered, the petitioner while trying to escape from the spot, while driving the Bolero car got involved in the unfortunate incident. It has further been stated that nothing is to be recovered from the said petitioner inasmuch as the car in question has already been taken into police custody.

On the other hand, the learned Senior Counsel for the complainant as well as the learned State counsel have submitted that the present petitioner was driving the Bolero car and even as per the SIT report, sought to be relied upon by the petitioner, it was a case where two persons namely, Harminder Singh and Jasdeep had died on account of rash driving. Although, as per their version, it is the case of murder but even in case the present case is taken to be a case under Section 304 IPC, then also, since the said petitioner was driving the Bolero car, thus, he should not be granted the concession of anticipatory bail.

Keeping in view the above-said facts, moreso, the fact that both as per the SIT report and the FIR, the present petitioner was driving the Bolero car, thus, this Court finds that the petitioner-Jaslovepreet Singh Sidhu does

not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail and thus, the present petition is dismissed.

However, nothing stated above shall be construed as a final expression of opinion on the merits of the case and the trial would proceed independently of the observations made in the present case which are only for the purpose of adjudicating the present bail application.

3. Harmandeep Singh @ Harmandeep Singh Gill (petitioner in case No.4 CRM-M-32999-2021):-

Learned Senior counsel for the petitioner has submitted that even as per the FIR, petitioner was sitting on the back seat of the Pajero car and was not driving the car and thus, could not be held responsible for the incident. It is further submitted that even as per the supplementary statement/challan, no specific injury with any weapon has been attributed to this petitioner and that the Petitioner had applied for anticipatory bail before the Additional Sessions Judge Moga, which was dismissed on 03.08.2021 and thereafter, the petitioner has approached this Court immediately and are ready to join the investigation and thus, it is not a case where the petitioner is trying to evade the process of law. It has also been pointed out that the Petitioner is in fact, 15 years and 10 months old and is a juvenile and has referred to various judgments including the judgment of a Co-ordinate Bench in CRM-M 19907 of 2017 titled as Krishan Kumar Minor v. State of Haryana, to contend that anticipatory bail under Section 438 CrPC in the case of a minor would be maintainable and his case should be considered taking a lenient view.

Learned Senior counsel for the complainant along with the learned State counsel has submitted that the said petitioner is the nephew of

Jasmail, co-accused, who is the brother of Narinder Pal Singh Sidhu (petitioner in case No.5) and that, all of them with a common intention had committed the act in question. It is further submitted that the plea of the Petitioner being a juvenile has not been taken earlier and is for the first time sought to be raised in the present proceedings.

Keeping in view the fact that the present petitioner was not driving any vehicle nor any specific injury with any weapon has been attributed to him either in the FIR or in the supplementary statement or in the Challan and also keeping in view the fact that there could be a possibility that while escaping in their vehicles, the said incident has taken place, this Court feels that the petitioner deserves the concession of bail and thus, CRM-M-33698-2021 is allowed and the petitioner-Harmandeep Singh is granted anticipatory bail.

However, the petitioner shall join the investigation as and when required to do so by the Investigating Officer and shall abide by the conditions as envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

However, nothing stated above shall be construed as a final expression of opinion on the merits of the case and the trial would proceed independently of the observations made in the present case which are only for the purpose of adjudicating the present bail application.

**4 and 5. Paramjeet Singh @ Pamma and Gurpreet Singh @ Gopi
(petitioners in case No.6 CRM-M-32506-2021).**

The said petitioners are seeking regular bail. Learned Senior counsel for the petitioners has submitted that even as per the FIR version both the said petitioners were sitting on the back seat of Bolero and Pajero cars, respectively and were not driving the vehicle. No specific injury has been attributed to either of them, either in the FIR or in the supplementary

statement or in the Challan. The petitioners have been in custody since 10.02.2021 and 12.02.2021, respectively and no recovery is to be effected from them and the challan has already been presented in the case and the Petitioners are not involved in any other case.

Learned Senior counsel for the complainant as well as learned State counsel have submitted that the said petitioners were a part of the conspiracy and had along with the other co-accused with an intention to kill have injured the deceased as well as the two injured persons and thus, they do not deserve the concession of regular bail.

Keeping in view the fact that the petitioners were not driving any vehicle even as per the allegation in the FIR and have not been attributed any specific injury with any weapon in the FIR or in the supplementary statement or in the challan and also the fact that they have been in custody since 10.02.2021 and 12.02.2021, respectively and challan in the case has already been presented and as per the custody certificate, which is taken on record, they both have already undergone 06 months and 20 days and are not involved in any other case, this Court deems it appropriate to allow the present petition for bail.

Accordingly, this petition is allowed and the petitioners- Paramjeet Singh @ Pamma and Gurpreet Singh @ Gopi are ordered to be released on bail on their furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial court/duty magistrate.

However, nothing stated above shall be construed as a final expression of opinion on the merits of the case and the trial would proceed independently of the observations made in the present case which are only for the purpose of adjudicating the present bail application.

6. Narinder Pal Singh Sidhu (petitioner in case No.5 CRM-M-

28007-2021).

The abovestated petitioner is seeking regular bail in the above said FIR.

Learned Senior counsel for the petitioner has submitted that although as per the FIR, the petitioner is stated to be driving the Pajero car but however, as per the detailed SIT report, it has specifically been found in the investigation that the said petitioner had a rod inserted in his left leg and the ankle of his right leg was also locked thus, the said petitioner is unfit and cannot drive and as per the investigation conducted, at the time of the incident, the said Pajero car was being driven by Jasmail Singh @ Nikku. Further reliance has been placed upon the said SIT report to state that a huge crowd had gathered at the time of the incident and they had started breaking the vehicles of the petitioner party and thus, the petitioner party had to leave the place of occurrence and in the process, the incident took place. Learned Senior counsel has also relied upon the photographs to show that the vehicles in question have been damaged. Learned Senior counsel for the petitioner has also referred to the medical report (Annexure P-10 in CRM-M 28007/2021) to substantiate the plea that the petitioner has got an iron rod inserted in his left leg. It is submitted that the version in the FIR is completely false and even the report of SIT proves the said fact. It is submitted that in case the Petitioner had any intention to kill and had pre-planned the incident, then, it would have been Gurtej Singh, husband of the candidate contesting the elections, who would have been attacked and the said Gurtej would have received grievous injuries. It is further submitted that the petitioner has been in custody since 10.02.2021 and the challan has also been presented and nothing is to be recovered from the petitioner and the Petitioner is not involved in any other case.

On the other hand, learned Senior counsel for the complainant as well as the learned State counsel have submitted that as per the FIR and the supplementary statement, the said petitioner was the one who was driving the Pajero car and he being the husband of Paramjeet Kaur Sidhu, who was contesting the election, was the person who had the intention to kill the deceased.

Keeping in view the above said facts and circumstances, moreso, the fact that as per the custody certificate which is taken on record, the said petitioner has already undergone actual sentence of 06 months and 20 days and is not involved in any other case and challan has been presented and also the fact that the petitioner has a rod in his left leg and his right ankle being locked as per the SIT report and as per the medical reports (Annexure P-10 in CRM-M 28007 of 2021), thus, the question as to whether he could even drive the vehicle or not is debatable and even the fact as to whether the incident has occurred on account of there being a huge crowd and the accused party were trying to escape in their vehicles or on account of specific intention to attack the complainant party is also a debatable issue, thus, this Court finds that the said petitioner-Narinder Pal Singh Sidhu deserves the concession of regular bail.

Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial court/duty magistrate.

However, nothing stated above shall be construed as a final expression of opinion on the merits of the case and the trial would proceed independently of the observations made in the present case which are only for the purpose of adjudicating the present bail application.

7. Titi Sharma @ Tribhuwandeep Sharma v. State of Punjab (CRM-M-32442/2021) [Petitioner in case no.1]:

The aforesaid petitioner is seeking anticipatory bail in the abovesaid FIR. Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner has submitted that even as per the FIR, the present petitioner was sitting on the front seat of the Scorpio car bearing no. PB-05-AJ-0061 and was not driving the car. It is further submitted that no specific injury with any weapon has been attributed to the present petitioner, either in the FIR or in the supplementary statement or in the Challan. The Petitioner had applied for anticipatory bail before the Additional Sessions Judge Moga, which was dismissed on 02.08.2021 and the petitioner has approached this Court immediately thereafter and thus, it is not a case where the petitioner is trying to evade the process of law. Learned Senior Counsel has also referred to the Order dated 12.08.2021 passed a Coordinate Bench of this Court to show that the Petitioner is willing to join the investigation. The said order dated 12.08.2021 is reproduced hereinbelow:

“CRM-M-32442-2021

TITI SHARMA @ TRIBHAWAN DEEP SHARMA V/S

STATE OF PUNJAB

Present : Dr. Amol Rattan Singh Sidhu, Senior Advocate with Mr. Pratham Sethi, Advocate for the petitioner.

The case has been taken up for hearing through video conferencing.

The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.17 dated 10.02.2021

registered under Sections 302, 323, 188 and 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 in Police Station City Moga, District Moga.

Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the case. The petitioner is associated with Indian National Congress and is supporter of co-accused S. Narinder Pal Singh Sidhu. Wife of S. Narinder Pal Singh Sidhu was contesting election opposite to Kulwinder Kaur wife of the complaint. On 09.02.2021 when S. Narinder Pal Singh Sidhu came to know that complainant and his associates were creating hatred and were distributing liquor, he called ASI Jaswant Singh on the spot. In the meantime, complainant and his party workers started damaging one of the vehicles of S. Narinder Pal Singh Sidhu. A chaos was created by the complainant and his associates and somebody from the public started beating the complainant, Malkeet Singh, Jadeep Singh @ Bhola and Harminder Singh @ Bahhu and injuries were caused to them by unknown persons. Co-accused S. Narinder Pal Singh Sidhu, Jasmel Singh @ Nikku, Gurpreet Singh @ Gopi, and Paramjit Singh @ Pamma were arrested and challan was presented against them. The matter was further investigated after obtaining permission from the Court of Chief Judicial Magistrate and on further investigation, the version narrated by the complainant was found to be false qua the petitioner. The petitioner was not involved in commission of alleged offences and was not present on the spot in any of the vehicles. Non- bailable warrants of arrest was issued against the petitioner and proceedings for declaring

proclaimed offender have been initiated against him. The petitioner is ready to join the investigation.

Notice of motion.

Pursuant to supply of advance copy, Mr. P.S. Walia, Asstt. AG, Punjab has appeared and accepted notice on behalf of the respondent-State.

Learned State Counsel seeks time to file reply.

Adjourned to 23.08.2021.

(ARUN KUMAR TYAGI)

JUDGE”

Learned Senior counsel for the complainant along with the learned State counsel has submitted that the said petitioner is the neighbour of Narinder Pal Singh Sidhu (petitioner in case No.5) and that, all of them with a common intention had committed the act in question.

Keeping in view the fact that the present petitioner was not driving any vehicle nor any specific injury with any weapon has been attributed to him either in the FIR or in the supplementary statement or in the Challan and also keeping in view the fact that there could be a possibility that while escaping in their vehicles, the incident has taken place, thus, this Court feels that the petitioner deserves the concession of bail and thus, CRM-M-32442-2021 is allowed and the petitioner-Titi Sharma is granted anticipatory bail.

However, the petitioner shall join the investigation as and when required to do so by the Investigating Officer and shall abide by the conditions as envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

However, nothing stated above shall be construed as a final

expression of opinion on the merits of the case and the trial would proceed independently of the observations made in the present case which are only for the purpose of adjudicating the present bail application.

Since all the petitions have been decided, all pending criminal miscellaneous, applications, in all cases, if any, shall also stand disposed of

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

September 13, 2021.
sandeep

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