

HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

104

CRM-M-54717-2022

Date of Decision: 24.11.2022

Ritik Kumar

... Petitioner

VS.

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. Munish Bhardwaj, Advocate for the petitioner

Sandeep Moudgil, J. (Oral)

The petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case FIR No.111 dated 10.08.2022 under Sections 379-B(2)/307/325/148/149/120-B IPC (Section 307/325/148/149/120-B IPC added later on), registered at Police Station Goraya, District Jalandhar.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner was not named in the FIR nor any specific role has been attributed to him so as to implicate him under Section 307/325 IPC, in particular.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. Rajiv Verma, DAG Punjab accepts notice.

Mr. NS Mahal, Advocate has filed vakalatnama on behalf of the complainant which is taken on record.

Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Bawa Singh, submits that the injuries given by the petitioner to the complainant are with handle of handpump on the head and with baseball bat resulting into fracture of right leg of the complainant, were declared to be dangerous to life. The petitioner was arrayed as an accused on the basis of the disclosure statement

made by Naresh Kumar – the main accused, along with other accused persons.

On the other hand, learned counsel for the complainant has produced certain photographs showing the nature of injuries and the film of x-ray, which are taken on record as Mark ‘A’, collectively.

Keeping in view the nature of injuries and the manner in which the injured has been made to suffer with criminal assault by the petitioner, no ground is made out for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, at this stage.

Dismissed being devoid of merits.

24.11.2022
V.Vishal

- 1. Whether speaking/reasoned?
- 2. Whether reportable?

(Sandeep Moudgil)
Judge

Yes/No
Yes/No