

101 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-53341-2023

Date of decision : November 07, 2023

PARVEEN @ MONU

....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Mr. Rahul Yadav, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Bhupender, Singh, DAG, Haryana.

KULDEEP TIWARI,J. (ORAL)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C., is for the grant of concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 286 dated 13.09.2022, under Sections 148, 149, 120-B, 307, 452 IPC and 25 (1)(b)(a), 27-54-59 of the Arms Act, 1959 registered at Police Station Salhawas, Jhajjar.

2. The allegations against the petitioner are that the assailants Rinku and Parveen @ Monu (present petitioner) while carrying pistols along with other persons had entered into the house of the complainant. Rinku had fired a shot on the complainant's father from the pistol which was carried by him and the same hit the father of complainant. Thereafter, the present petitioner also fired a shot on the complainant from his pistol but the same did not hit the complainant.

3. In pursuance of the order dated 19.10.2023, the learned State counsel has filed status report by way of an affidavit of Anil Kumar, HPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Head Quarters, District Jhajjar on behalf of respondent-State, which is taken on record. It is disclosed in the status report that during the investigation, accused Sunil @ Sethi, Karan

@ Punjabi, Sujal Khanna @ Love, Sunil @ Anil, Ashish @ Bholu, Rahul @ Kala and Kamaljeet @ Hunny, were arrested in the present case and their disclosure statements were recorded, and on the basis of the statement of accused Sunil @ Sethi, recovery of three live cartridges was effected and on the basis of the disclosure statement of accused Aashish @ Bhola recovery of a country made pistol was also effected from the residence of the present petitioner and a vehicle bearing No. HR-77C-5038, used in the crime was recovered from the Village Matanhail and the place of occurrence was demarcated. Despite conducting various raids by the police, the petitioner could not be arrested, though the case was registered way back on 13.09.2022.

4. The learned State counsel submits that the regular bail application filed by co-accused Sunil @ Anil has been dismissed by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 18.04.2023.

5. Considering the role assigned to the present petitioner and the factum that he is evading arrest for more than one year, this Court is not inclined to grant the extraordinary relief of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. In sequel, the present petition for anticipatory bail is, hereby, dismissed.

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

November 07, 2023
ajay-1

Whether speaking/reasoned ? Yes/No
Whether Reportable ? Yes/No