

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

**CRM-M No. 53041 of 2021
Date of decision: 20.12.2021**

Ajaypal Singh Dhillon Petitioner.

Versus

State of Punjab Respondent.

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL

Present:- Mr. Gagandeep Singh Simble, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Karanbir Singh, AAG, Punjab, for the respondent-State.

ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL, J. (ORAL)

The petitioner is seeking anticipatory bail in FIR No.57 dated 19.02.2021, under Sections 323, 324, 341, 506 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ('IPC' - for short) (Sections 354-B and 325 of the IPC were added later), registered at Police Station Ranjit Avenue, District Amritsar.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that it is alleged that the petitioner had beaten up the complainant and two others, but only a fracture on the arm was found for which offence punishable under Section 325 of the IPC could be invoked, which is a bailable. He also contends that earlier offence punishable under Section 326 of the IPC had been incorporated in the FIR, but the same was deleted after taking medical opinion. He also contends that the FIR is a counter blast to the FIR lodged by the petitioner in the year 2019.

Learned State counsel, upon instructions from ASI Bharat Raj, contends that the wife of the complainant had made a statement that her

clothes had been torn by the petitioner and offence punishable under Section 354-B had been added. He also contends that the petitioner was also involved in several other cases which has been controverted by learned counsel for the petitioner stating that those cases had been quashed.

Heard. This is the second petition for anticipatory bail preferred by the petitioner. The first petition bearing CRM-M No. 25939 of 2021 was dismissed by this Court on 30.07.2021. The allegations against the petitioner are that he had attacked the complainant and his wife in broad day light when they had gone to attend an engagement ceremony. The petitioner was allegedly armed with a 'dadar'. The injuries have been caused to the wife and mother-in-law of the complainant as well. The clothes of the wife of the complainant had also been torn by the petitioner for which offence punishable under Section 354-B of the IPC was added. In view of serious allegations against the petitioner of having beaten up the complainant and two ladies, I do not deem it appropriate to take another view in the matter, especially when earlier petition for anticipatory bail preferred by the petitioner had been dismissed.

Consequently, the petition stands dismissed.

(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

20.12.2021
Ramesh

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No