

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

105

CRM-M-59974-2023

Date of decision: 30.11.2023

Vikramjit Singh @ Bikramjit Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present : Mr. Gagagandeep Singh Simble, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Anurag Chopra, Advocate
for the complainant.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of anticipatory bail under Section 438 of the Cr.P.C. in case FIR No.63 dated 16.11.2023 under Sections 307, 342, 382, 323, 506, 148, 149 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and Sections 25/54/59 of the Arms Act, 1959 registered at Police Station Airport, District Amritsar.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner inter alia submits that a totally false and fabricated case has been planted upon the petitioner on account of the complainant wielding a lot of influence in the area. The petitioner is completely innocent and was not even present at the time of the alleged occurrence at the dhaba, which is further fortified from the fact that the CCTV footage did not reflect his presence at the place of occurrence or support the allegations made in the FIR. He submits that the petitioner at the time of the alleged occurrence was at a hospital where he had taken his wife for some treatment and his presence at the

hospital was seen in the CCTV footage of the hospital.

3. Notice of motion.

4. On asking of the Court, Ms. Kanica Sachdeva, AAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State.

5. At this stage, Mr. Anurag Chopra, Advocate has entered appearance on behalf of the complainant.

6. Learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for the complainant, on instructions from ASI Tarseem Singh, has vehemently opposed the prayer made by the counsel opposite by submitting that there was enough material collected from the Dhaba i.e. the place of occurrence, pointing to the involvement of the petitioner in the occurrence in question. Rather, to destroy evidence, all the accused had removed the CCTV cameras and when the police arrived at the spot, the wires of the CCTV were found hanging. It has further been contended that it was a well planned attack; the injured complainant was called telephonically to the dhaba of the accused party; all the accused were armed with weapons such as pistol, hockey sticks, baseball clubs etc. with which they inflicted various injuries including injury inviting the mischief of Section 307 of the IPC, on the person of not only the complainant but also his friend Rachit who was also accompanying him at the relevant time.

7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant material on record.

8. Prima facie there are serious and specific allegations levelled against the petitioner of having inflicted injuries on the complainant with a hockey stick which injuries were declared to be

dangerous to life. In the facts and circumstances, this Court is not inclined to extend the extraordinary concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

9. Accordingly, the instant petition stands dismissed.

10. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

30.11.2023

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)

Vinay

JUDGE

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