

CRM-M-45338-2022

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

CRM-M-45338-2022

Date of decision:13.12.2022

Raman

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. S.K.Verma, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Gagandeep Singh Chhina, AAG Haryana.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

Through this petition, the petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No.83 dated 06.03.2022, registered at Police Station Civil Lines, Kaithal, under Sections 148, 149, 323, 325, 379-B, 458 and 506 IPC.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case; that the petitioner and co-accused, Mandeep were the employees of the complainant and they had a dispute with the latter qua the salary and that it was the complainant, who had called upon the petitioner and the co-accused for the settlement. Learned counsel further contends that neither any specific role nor any specific injury has been attributed to the petitioner, and that recovery of chain was effected from co-accused, Mandeep, who has since been granted the concession of regular bail.

CRM-M-45338-2022

On the other hand, learned State counsel, while opposing the grant of bail to the petitioner, submits that the petitioner and the co-accused, who were armed with batons (dandas), had entered the cable office of Kamal where the complainant was also sitting, and that the petitioner and the co-accused caused injuries to the complainant and had also snatched his gold chain, which was recovered from the co-accused. He further contends that there are as many as six other cases registered or pending against the petitioner. As such, the petitioner does not deserve the concession of bail.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

There are serious allegations against the petitioner that he alongwith the co-accused entered the office of one Kamal where the complainant was sitting, and had inflicted injuries upon him. The accused also snatched his gold chain, which was recovered from co-accused Mandeep.

Moreover, the petitioner has as many as six other cases registered or pending against him. In the considered opinion of this Court, the purpose of investigation would stand defeated by allowing the petitioner to join investigation, especially keeping in view his antecedents. Moreover, the criminal antecedents of the habitual offender(s) like the petitioner, which shatter the very tranquility of the collective, do not entitle him to be enlarged on bail.

In view of the above, this Court finds that the petitioner is required for custodial interrogation to recover *danda* and motor-cycle used in the present case.

CRM-M-45338-2022

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

13.12.2022
parveen kumar

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?	Yes/No
Whether reportable?	Yes/No