

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

1.

CRM-M-10208-2022

Date of decision: March 10, 2022

Shanty Sharma

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

....Respondent

2.

CRM-M-10212-2022

Banty Sharma

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

Present: Ms. Monita Mehta, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Joginder Pal Ratra, DAG, Punjab

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J.

By this common order, this Court intends to dispose of the aforesaid two petitions as they arise out of the same FIR.

In the above mentioned two petitions, the petitioners, namely, Shanty Sharma and Banty Sharma pray for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.12 dated 7.2.2022 under Sections 323, 332, 353, 186, 148, 149 IPC, registered at Police Station Cantt. Jalandhar, District Jalandhar.

Counsel for the petitioner submits that as per the allegations in the FIR, registered at the instance of ASI/LR Surjit Singh it is stated that when he was on traffic duty along with ASI/LR Pavitar Singh and managing the traffic in appropriate manner near a bridge, the petitioners came on a

motorcycle. When the complainant gave them indication to stop, they started abusing and fighting with him. In the meantime, their wives also came at the spot and 5/6 unknown persons also came there and started fighting and torn his uniform and disrupted in discharging his duty and caused simple and blunt injuries. Counsel for the petitioners further submits that the injury attributed to the petitioners are simple in nature.

The learned State counsel has, however, submitted that as per the MLR of Surjit Singh, the doctor has mentioned four injuries, which are simple and blunt in nature and it is further reported that he has suffered reddish bruise on the left lower eyelid, abrasion on right chin, besides complain of pain on right hypogastric area and clotted blood was present on lower lip with two superficial lacerations on inner side of upper lip.

After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and looking into the serious allegations against the petitioners and the manner in which the petitioners have not only torn the uniform of a public servant, who was on traffic duty but also restrained him from performing the official duty and then caused him multiple injuries, I find no ground to grant the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

The petitions are, therefore, dismissed.

March 10, 2022
satish

(ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN)
JUDGE

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