

101

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

-.-

CRM M 46614-2023
Date of Decision 21.09.2023*Baljit Singh alias Raju**.....Petitioner**versus**State of Punjab**...Respondent***Coram Hon'ble Mr. Justice Rajbir Sehrawat**Present: Mr. S S Ranghi, Advocate for the petitioner
 Mr. Sandeep Singh, Additional Advocate General, Punjab

-.-

Rajbir Sehrawat, J. (Oral)

The present petition has been filed under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, praying for grant of anticipatory/pre-arrest bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 68 dated 01.07.2023, registered under Sections 307, 379, 506, 295-A, 447, 511, 323, 120-B, 148, 149, 427 of the Indian Penal Code and Sections 25, 27 of the Arms Act, at Police Station Dehlon, District Police Commissionerate, Ludhiana.

It is submitted by counsel for the petitioner that the present is a case of version and cross version and the petitioner has wrongly been implicated in the case. The name of the petitioner was not even mentioned in the FIR. However, his name has been dragged unnecessarily in this case only on the basis of supplementary statement of the complainant. There is no other case against the petitioner. Hence, the petitioner deserves to be protected against his arrest.

Notice of motion.

Mr. Sandeep Singh, Additional Advocate General, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the respondent State.

Counsel for the State being instructed by Head Constable Sanjeev Kumar, Police Station Dehlon, District Ludhiana has submitted that the petitioner has been duly named in the supplementary statement. The said supplementary statement of the complainant is duly supported by the material, which has been collected by the Police so far, including the photographs and videos of the spot. Undoubtedly, it is a case of version and cross-version. However, even the person who caused injuries to the other side has already been arrested in the cross version. The investigation is at the initial stage. Therefore, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is imperative in the case.

In view of the facts and circumstances available on the file, as well as, submissions made by counsel for the State, this Court does not find it appropriate to interfere in the matter so as to grant the concession of anticipatory bail.

Dismissed.

(Rajbir Sehrawat)
Judge

21.09.2023
mohan bimbra

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