

CRM-M-8981-2021

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

**CRM-M-8981-2021 (O & M)
Date of Decision: 07.03.2022**

Shingara Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present: Mr. Mohd. Yousaf, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J.(Oral)

CRM-28942-2021

Allowed as prayed for. Annexure P-12 is taken on record,
subject to all just exceptions.

CRM-M-8981-2021

Through this petition, the petitioner (complainant) seeks
cancellation of anticipatory bail granted to respondents No.2 and 3, vide
orders dated 04.02.2021 (Annexures P-10 and P-11) passed by the learned
Additional Sessions Judge, Jalandhar, in case bearing FIR No.128 dated
13.11.2020, registered at Police Station City Nakodar, District Jalandhar,
under Sections 326, 323, 324, 341 and 34 IPC.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that respondents
No.2 and 3 alongwith co-accused in furtherance of their common intentions
had caused grievous injury to the petitioner-complainant, and that the
aforesaid act of the accused was pre-planned. He further contends that there
are three other FIRs registered against respondents No.2 and 3, as would

CRM-M-8981-2021

decipher from the document (Annexure P-12), but while granting bail to them, learned Additional Sessions Judge, Jalandhar, has totally lost sight of the said vital aspect of the matter.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

While granting anticipatory bail to respondents No.2 and 3, learned Additional Sessions Judge, has discussed the role attributed to them and noticed that respondent No.2 was attributed no injury, whereas respondent No.3 was attributed a *dang* blow, attracting the offence under Section 323 IPC. It has also been noticed that the alleged occurrence took place on 06.11.2020 whereas the above-noted FIR stood registered on 13.11.2020 i.e. after a delay of 07 days.

So far as the contention of learned counsel for the petitioner with regard to the criminal antecedents of respondents No.2 and 3, is concerned, suffice it to say that the FIRs mentioned in Annexure P-12 stood registered prior to the present occurrence. Moreover, learned counsel for the petitioner has failed to show that respondents No.2 and 3 have misused the concession of bail granted to them, vide orders dated 04.02.2021 (Annexures P-10 and P-11).

In view of the above, this Court finds that the impugned orders do not suffer from any illegality.

Therefore, finding no merit in the present petition, the same is dismissed.

07.03.2022

parveen kumar

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

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