

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

101

CRM-M No.46639 of 2023 (O&M)
DATE OF DECISION: 20th SEPTEMBER, 2023

Jaspreet Singh

.... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJBIR SEHRAWAT

Present : Ms. Sunaina, Advocate
for the petitioner.

* * * *

RAJBIR SEHRAWAT, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.8 dated 02.02.2022 registered under Sections 307, 452, 323, 325, 341, 506, 148 and 149 IPC at Police Station Banur, District Patiala.

2. It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that the case against the petitioner is totally concocted. He is not involved in the crime as alleged against him. Even as per the story of the prosecution, the name of the petitioner was not mentioned in the FIR in the first instance. Even as per subsequent version, the petitioner is alleged to have caused injuries on the shoulder of the complainant. Therefore, the offence alleged under Section 307 IPC is not attributable to the petitioner. The petitioner is ready to join the investigation as and when called by the

Investigating Officer. Therefore, the petitioner deserves to be protected against his arrest.

3. Notice of motion.
4. Mr. Sandeep, Additional Advocate General, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent/State.
5. Learned State counsel, being instructed by ASI Jaswinder Pal, has submitted that the petitioner is one of the two named accused, who has caused injuries to the complainant. The co-accused of the petitioner has caused injuries on the head and the petitioner has caused injuries on the shoulder of the complainant. Both the injuries have been declared to be grievous in nature. Therefore, the petitioner is involved in heinous crime. The police are yet to recover the weapon of offence. Therefore, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is imperative in the case. Hence, the petitioner does not deserve any protection against his arrest at the stage of investigation.
6. In view of the facts and circumstances available on record, as well as, the submissions made by learned counsel for the State, this Court does not find it appropriate to interfere in the matter so as to protect the petitioner against his arrest.
7. Dismissed.

20th SEPTEMBER, 2023

‘sandeep’

(RAJBIR SEHRAWAT)

JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned:</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>
<i>Whether Reportable:</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>