

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.23796 of 2023
Date of decision: 5th July, 2023

Amandeep Singh @ Amani

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Gulzar Mohammad, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Subhash Godara, Addl. Advocate General, Punjab
for the respondent/State.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J.

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of anticipatory bail in FIR No.32 dated 24.04.2021 for the offences under Sections 307, 341, 323, 324, 148, 149, 506 IPC registered at Police Station Division No.4, Police Commissionerate Jalandhar (Annexure P-1).

2. This Court, while issuing notice of motion on 11.05.2023, had passed the following order :-

“Learned counsel inter alia contends that it is a case of version and cross version, wherein injuries were received by both the sides at the hands of each other.

On a pointed query put to the learned counsel as to whether the petitioner had been attributed injury dangerous to life, he has replied in the negative.

Notice of motion for 26.05.2023.”

3. On being put to notice, the learned State counsel has at the outset on instructions, submitted that the petitioner was armed with a datar at the time of the occurrence and inflicted a grievous injury on the head of the injured Daljit Singh, which was opined to be dangerous to life by the Doctor.

4. It has further been contended by the learned State counsel that it was a premeditated attack carried out by all the accused, including the petitioner, who were about 10 in number, on account of a previous dispute between the parties. All the accused were armed with lethal weapons with which they inflicted grievous injuries on injured Daljit Singh and one other person, while they were at a barber's shop. So much so, when the injured were being removed to the hospital, the accused including the petitioner again waylaid them and inflicted more injuries with their respective firearms. Learned State counsel prays for dismissal of the instant petition as custodial interrogation of the petitioner would be required.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant material on record.

6. There are prima facie serious and specific allegations against the petitioner, who inflicted injuries on the head of the injured, inviting the mischief of Section 307 IPC. In the facts and circumstances as enumerated hereinabove, the petitioner does not deserve the

extraordinary concession of anticipatory bail. The petition accordingly stands dismissed.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

July 5, 2023
rps

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