

216

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No. 40094 of 2023

Decided on: 12.10.2023

KULDEEP KUMAR

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

... Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY

Present:- Mr. Prashant Vashishth, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Anmol Singh Sandhu, AAG, Punjab.

.....

SANJIV BERRY, J (ORAL)

By way of the present petition filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C the petitioner is praying for anticipatory bail in the event of arrest in FIR (Annexure P-1) detailed as under:-

FIR No.	Dated	Sections	Police Station
69	23.06.2023	307, 149, 148, 323 IPC	Mehatpur, Jalandhar-rural

2. It is, *inter alia* contended by counsel representing the petitioner that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case and the present case, infact has been registered as a counter blast of FIR No. 38 of 2022 dated 23.04.2022, registered at Police Station Mehatpur, Jalandhar Rural, Punjab which was got registered by the petitioner. He submits that no overact has been attributed to the petitioner and hence prayed for grant of concession of bail.

3. *Per contra*, the learned State counsel has opposed the bail application by referring to the reply submitted by Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub Division Shahkot, District Jalandhar (Rural) dated 11.09.2023, to submit that there are specific injuries attributed to the petitioner and he has alleged to have caused 4 injuries on the person of injured Gaurav with his Datar a sharp edged weapon, including one on his forehead, which was declared as grievous in nature. He is also stated to have caused injuries to Raj and Thomas, and hence, he prayed for dismissal of petition, as the custodial interrogation of petitioner is required in this case.

4. After considering the respective arguments and perusing the record, it transpires that there are specific allegations against the petitioner of having caused multiple injuries on the person of injured with his Datar on the forehead which has been found to be grievous in nature. Multiple injuries have also been caused to the injured by the petitioner and his accomplice. Besides this case, three other cases were also registered against the petitioner as per reply dated 11.09.2023, out of which in one case he has been acquitted.,

5. Therefore, considering the nature and gravity of the offence, I find no case is made out in favour of the petitioner for grant of anticipatory bail, the petition is hereby dismissed.

6. Any observation made above shall not be construed as opinion of this Court on the merits of the case.

(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE

12.10.2023

Gyan

i)	Whether speaking/reasoned?	Yes/No
ii)	Whether reportable?	Yes/No