

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH
Sr. No.208

CRM-M-20051-2023 (O&M)

Date of decision : 01.05.2023

Harmandeep Singh

..... Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR MITTAL

Present: Mr. A.S. Kler, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Kamalpreet Bawa, AAG, Punjab

Mr. Ankush Singla, Advocate, for the complainant.

SUDHIR MITTAL, J. (Oral)

Status report dated 29.04.2023 has been in filed in Court on behalf of the State. The same is taken on record. A copy thereof has been supplied to learned counsel for the petitioner.

This petition has been filed for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.84 dated 01.04.2023, registered at Police Station Civil Lines Bathinda, District Bathinda, under Sections 379-B (2)/34 IPC.

According to the contents of the FIR, the petitioner and his co-accused snatched a gold chain from the neck of the wife of the complainant. Since, she resisted, a brick was thrown at her face resulting in fracture of her jaw. The son of the complainant rushed out of his house to help his mother, but before he could do anything, the petitioner and co-accused fled on motorcycle which did not carry any number plate.

On 24.04.2023, the State had been directed to file a status report as it had been contended on behalf of the petitioner that it was a simple case of the motorcycle of the petitioner having hit the car of the

outside his house. Status report aforementioned has been filed in Court today, according to contents of which, the submission made on 24.04.2023 was incorrect. The son of the complainant has recorded the incident on his mobile and certain photographs have been annexed as Annexure R-4 which shows that the petitioner was riding motorcycle without number plate and he alongwith the co-accused were fleeing the spot. It has further been stated that CCTV footage from the neighbouring house could not be obtained as the camera was not functioning.

Faced with this situation, learned counsel for the petitioner has reiterated the submissions made on 24.04.2023 and has prayed for leniency as the petitioner is a school student and does not have any criminal antecedents.

Merely because the petitioner is a school going student, he is not entitled to commit heinous crime like snatching and to associate with persons who can go to the extent of causing severe injuries with a brick. The same could have been fatal also.

Thus, the petitioner does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail.

The petition is dismissed.

(SUDHIR MITTAL)
JUDGE

01.05.2023.
Ramandeep Singh

Whether speaking / reasoned

Yes

Whether Reportable

No