

CRM-M-45265-2022

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-45265-2022

Date of decision: 12.09.2023

BAGEL SINGH

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. A.S.Barnala, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. C.L.Pawar, Addl. A. G. Punjab.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

1. Through this petition, the petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case FIR No. 70 dated 18.02.2020, registered under Sections 307, 324, 323, 148, 149, 506 IPC, at Police Station City Barnala, District Barnala.
2. Learned State counsel points out that complainant-Gurpreet Singh @ Laddi and injured-Harwinder Singh are present in the Court.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner very fairly states that the petitioner has been allegedly attributed following injuries on the person of Harwinder Singh:

- “1. Multiple linear wound on lateral aspect of left leg. Adv. X-ray.
2. Curved incised wound on left side of face extending to left side of neck with profused bleeding. Bone deep. Adv. X-ray and ENT.

It is further submitted that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case; that in pursuance of the order dated 10.02.2023, the petitioner

CRM-M-45265-2022

has joined investigation and that co-accused, namely, Rajveer Singh, who has allegedly been attributed injury on the left elbow of Harwinder Singh, stands granted the concession of anticipatory bail by a Coordinate Bench, vide order dated 31.01.2023.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel opposes the grant of bail to the petitioner. He, on instructions from ASI Gurcharan Singh, submits that though the petitioner has joined investigation, yet the fact remains that he is the person, who had inflicted injury on the vital part of injured-Harwinder Singh.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

6. As per the case of prosecution, the petitioner had caused two injuries on the person of Harwinder Singh i.e. one on the neck and another on the left leg. One cannot dispute the fact that the neck is a vital part of the body.

7. In view of the nature and gravity of the offence coupled with the fact that a specific injury on the vital part of the injured has been attributed to the petitioner, this Court finds that he is not entitled to the benefit of anticipatory bail.

8. Therefore, finding no merit in the present petition, the same is dismissed.

9. Nothing observed herein-above shall be construed to be an expression of opinion of this Court on the merits of the case.

12.09.2023

parveen kumar

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?

Yes/No

Whether reportable?

Yes/No