

108 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

Neutral Citation No. 2023:PHHC:132031
CRM-M-51569-2023
Date of Decision: October 11, 2023

Vinod Kumar

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK GUPTA

Present:- Ms. Divya Narula, Advocate for the petitioner.

DEEPAK GUPTA, J.(Oral)

This is the second petition filed by the petitioner seeking anticipatory bail in case FIR No.475, dated 27.08.2023, under Sections 323, 324, 452 and 506 of IPC, registered at Police Station Rania, District Sirsa. The earlier petition bearing No.CRM-M-46935-2023 was dismissed by this Court, vide order dated 03.10.2023 by passing the following order:-

“Prayer in this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. is for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.475, dated 27.08.2023, under Sections 323, 324, 452 and 506 of IPC, registered at Police Station Rania, District Sirsa.

The allegations are that on 26.08.2023, petitioner Vinod Kumar not only caught hold of Madho Devi, the mother of the complainant, but when complainant tried to come to rescue his mother, petitioner gave daggar like knife blows on the various parts of the body of the complainant. As per MLR, as many as 06 injuries were caused on the head, chest and stomach of the complainant.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is a disabled person and so he could not be in a position even to move. She has also placed on record the copy of the Disability Certificate to reveal that petitioner is suffering from locomotive disability in his right leg. However, no extent of disability is mentioned in the Disability Certificate nor the said disability or certificate is pleaded in the petition.

*Having regard to the direct attribution to the petitioner, no case for grant of anticipatory bail is made out.
Dismissed.”*

It is contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that certain facts were not brought to her notice by the petitioner, due to which second petition has been filed.

Heard.

Learned counsel for the petitioner could not convince about any such fact, which could not have been disclosed at the time of hearing of the first petition. No ground for granting the benefit of anticipatory bail is made out.

Dismissed.

October 11, 2023
sarita

(DEEPAK GUPTA)
JUDGE

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