

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

214

CRM-M-27280-2023

Date of decision: 07.08.2023

Inderjit Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present : Mr. Piyush Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. I.P.S. Sabharwal, DAG, Punjab.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of anticipatory bail under Section 438 of the Cr.P.C. in case FIR No.21 dated 21.02.2023 under Sections 307, 324, 323, 148 and 149 of the IPC (Section 326 of the IPC added lateron) registered at Police Station Cantt Ferozepur, District Ferozepur.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner inter alia contends that a false case has been planted upon the petitioner on account of local politics. He submits that in fact all the offences except under Section 307 of the IPC are bailable and even the alleged injury attributed to the petitioner is on the non-vital part of the complainant's body.

3. Vide order 29.05.2023, the State had been put to notice and a status report by way of affidavit of Surinder Pal, PPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police (City) Ferozepur had been filed.

4. Learned counsel appearing for the State while drawing the attention of this Court to the FIR in question as well as its reply, has

submitted that it was a pre-mediated attack wherein all the accused including the petitioner attacked the injured complainant Gurbaj Singh with lethal weapons and inflicted as many as 19 injuries on his person. He further submits that the petitioner was armed with a kappa with which he inflicted an injury on the shoulder of the complainant just below his left ear besides also inflicting injuries on the right hand fingers of the complainant. It has been submitted that the injuries which were dangerous to life have been attributed to the petitioner.

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

6. Prima facie there are serious allegations levelled against the petitioner who along with co-accused inflicted multiple injuries on the person of the complainant with lethal weapons. Hence, in the facts and circumstances, the petitioner does not deserve the extraordinary concession of anticipatory bail.

7. Accordingly, the instant petition is dismissed.

8. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

07.08.2023

Vinay

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

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