

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-32552-2023 (O&M)

Date of Decision:18.07.2023

Mukul Mattu

. . . . Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

. . . . Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR JUSTICE DEEPAK GUPTA

Present: - Mr. Sahil Vashishat, Advocate, for the petitioner.

DEEPAK GUPTA, J.

CRM-27734-2023

Application is allowed as prayed for.

Certified copies of Annexures P1 to P3 are taken on record.

CRM-M-32552-2023

By way of this petition filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C., petitioner prays for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.48 dated 13.04.2023, registered under Sections 279, 332, 186, 353, 307, 427 and 34 (Section 120-B IPC added later on) at Police Station Division No.1, Ludhiana.

2. FIR was lodged on the complaint of one Hardeep Singh, as per which, on 13.04.2023, he was on duty at Mata Rani Chowk. One Honda Amaze Car No.PB08-ED-6007 was signaled to be stopped as the driver was talking on the mobile phone. Initially driver slowed down the car but then he suddenly ran the car over the complainant. Complainant fell on the bonnet of the car and the driver sped. After some distance, complainant fell

down. He received various injuries. Complainant came to know the name of the car driver as Mukul Mattu son of Rattu (petitioner herein) and that of the person sitting on the conductor seat as Mannu son of Mohan Lal.

3. It is contended by learned counsel that the petitioner has been falsely implicated; that he has nothing to do with the allegations as he is neither the owner of the alleged car nor had driven the same.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr.R.S. Khaira, DAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State.

6. Learned State counsel has drawn attention of the Court towards the contents of the FIR revealing that name of the petitioner is specifically mentioned to be driver of the car in question.

7. The allegations against the petitioner cannot be stated to be false or without any basis at this stage. He is specifically named to be the person who was driving the car and who tried to run over the car over the complainant, causing various injuries to him.

8. Having regard to the role attributed to the petitioner in the crime, but without commenting anything on the merits of the case, this Court does not find it to be a fit case to grant anticipatory bail.

Dismissed.

(DEEPAK GUPTA)
JUDGE

18.07.2023

Vivek

1. Whether speaking/reasoned?	Yes/No
2. Whether reportable?	Yes/No