

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh

CRM-M No. 36773 of 2021

Date of Decision: 23.9.2021

Pardeep @ Deepe

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present: Mr. J.P.Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Anil Kumar Sharma, Advocate for
complainant/respondent No. 2.

Mr. Satyavir Singh Yadav, Advocate, Notary Public
in person with Mr. S.K.Yadav, Advocate.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

In compliance of the order dated 07.9.2021, Mr. Satyavir Singh Yadav, Advocate, Notary Public, has appeared in person. He tenders his unconditional apology for not appending the date, while attesting the compromise and also placed on record his affidavit, the same is taken on record.

In view of the said fact, no further orders are called for in this regard.

Through the instant petition, the petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case FIR No. 450 dated 13.12.2020, registered under Sections 147, 149, 323, 506 and Sections 325 and 307 IPC (added later on), Police Station Kanina, District Mahendergarh.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the alleged

injuries attributed to the petitioner are blunt; that all the injuries are on the

non vital part of the body; that the offence under Section 307 IPC has been added later on and that now the parties have entered into a compromise.

Learned counsel for the petitioner very rightly points out that there are other cases pending against the petitioner.

Learned counsel for the complainant has not disputed the fact that the compromise has been effected between the parties.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

In the present case, there are specific allegations in the FIR against the petitioner that he gave danda blows on the head of complainant Naveen. The petitioner has been attributed four injuries out of which, injuries No. 1 to 3 were found to be grievous in nature whereas, injury No. 4 was found to be dangerous to life. Though, as per the learned counsel for the parties, a compromise has been effected between the parties, yet the petitioner has caused serious injuries on the vital part of the body i.e. head of the complainant and moreover, there are four other cases pending against the petitioner, out of which one is under Section 302 IPC.

Keeping in view the seriousness of allegations against the petitioner, no ground for grant of anticipatory bail to him is made out.

The petition is dismissed.

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

September 23, 2021
Gurpreet

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