

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

204

CRM-M-42049-2019

Date of decision : 02.12.2021

Charan Singh @ Charana

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.. Respondents

CORAM :HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL

Present:- Mr. Kuldip S. Chaudhary, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Anant Kataria, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Saransh Sabharwal, Advocate for respondents No.2 to 9.

Anupinder Singh Grewal, J. (Oral)

The petitioner has sought cancellation of anticipatory bail granted to respondents No.2 to 9 by the trial court vide order dated 31.08.2019/09.09.2019 in FIR No.118 dated 19.04.2019, under Sections 148, 149, 323, 452, 307, 506, 120-B IPC registered at Police Station Pinjore, Tehsil Kalka, District Panchkula.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that as respondents No.2 to 9 were duly named in the FIR and their role had also been specified, they did not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail. He also contends that respondent No.3-Dayal Kaur is alleged to have hurled a brick bat which hit the head of the injured-Mewa Singh.

Learned counsel for respondents No.2 to 9 contends that it is a case of version and cross-version as a cross FIR under Section 307 IPC had been lodged by Satbir Singh who had been seriously injured. The injury for which offence under Section 307 IPC has been invoked in the instant FIR is attributed to co-accused Mewa Singh who has been granted regular bail after a

year in custody. There is only one person-Harnek Singh, who was injured in the instant FIR and he has fully recovered from the injury.

Heard.

It is thus manifest that only respondent No.3 has been attributed a brick bat blow on the head of the injured. The injury on the head of the injured is also attributed to co-accused Mewa Singh who has been granted regular bail. He is the husband of respondent No.3. The anticipatory bail was granted about three years back and at this juncture, it would not be in the interest of justice to interfere therewith especially when respondent No.3 is a lady.

Consequently, I do not find any infirmity in the order granting anticipatory bail to respondents No.2 to 9 and the petition stands dismissed.

(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

December 02, 2021
sonia gugnani

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No