

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH
CRM-M-45266-2022**

Date of Decision: September 29, 2022

Sonu Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Ms. Gurpreet Kaur, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. J.S. Arora, DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, who has been booked for having committed the offences punishable under Sections 307, 323, 324, 380, 148 and 149 IPC and Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act, 1959, in a case arising out of FIR No. 343, dated 25.12.2021, registered at Police Station Ajnala, District Amritsar Rural.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that name of petitioner was not mentioned in the FIR, rather it surfaced after about six months of the alleged occurrence.

Notice of motion.

Mr. J.S. Arora, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab, who is present in the Court, accepts notice. Complete copy of the paper book has been supplied to him in advance. On instructions from ASI Ranjodh Singh, learned State counsel submits that one bullet hit in the stomach of Ranjha Singh, father of the complainant – Sandeep Singh and another fired bullet hit on the left arm of Rahul, who is brother of the complainant – Sandeep Singh. Learned State counsel further submits that name of petitioner – Sonu Singh was disclosed by injured – Rahul on 25.12.2021 itself. It has also been pointed out that there are three other cases pending against the petitioner.

Having heard learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record. From the submissions made by learned State counsel it becomes clear that the stand taken by learned counsel for the petitioner that his name surfaced for the first time after six months, is falsified. Moreover, the assailants including the petitioner are alleged to have entered the house of complainant party during intervening night of 24/25-12-2021 and after firing shots, they looted articles and cash also.

In para No. 13 of the petition, it is pleaded as under:-

“13. That the Petitioner has not been involved in any other criminal case/FIR of same nature except the present case and the Petitioner is not a Proclaimed Offender.”

On the contrary, learned State counsel has specifically pointed out that petitioner is also involved in three more cases. Thus, petitioner does not deserve any sympathy of the Court on account of concealment of facts.

There is no merit in the present case to grant concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

Dismissed.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

September 29, 2022

P Kapoor	Whether Speaking/Reasoned:	YES/NO
	Whether Reportable:	YES/NO