

CRM-M-9224-2024 (O&M)
CRM-M-14429-2024 (O&M)
CRM-M-16347-2024 (O&M)

-1-2024:PHHC:053393

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

204+102+207

Date of Decision:- 19.04.2024

1. CRM-M-9224-2024 (O&M)

MANVIR SINGH ALIAS MANGAL

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANR

...Respondent(s)

2. CRM-M-14429-2024 (O&M)

GURJEET KUMAR @ JAGGI

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent(s)

3. CRM-M-16347-2024 (O&M)

DAVINDER KUMAR ALIAS VICKY

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY

Present : Mr. Ruhani Chadha, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-9224-2024.

Mr. Ramesh Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner(s) in CRM-M-14429-2024 and
CRM-M-16347-2024.

Mr. Ankit Grewal, DAG Punjab.

SANJIV BERRY, J. (ORAL)

Status report dated 19.04.2024 filed in the form of an affidavit of Commissioner of Police, Jalandhar, is taken on record. Copy thereof has been supplied to learned counsel for the petitioner

2. Arguments heard.
3. By way of this common order, the above-mentioned three criminal miscellaneous petitions shall be decided as they arise out of the same FIR.
4. The present petitions have been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners in the event of arrest in FIR detailed as under:-

FIR No.	Dated	Sections	Police Station
24	23.01.2024	323, 324, 148, 149, 379-B IPC; (325 and 326 IPC added later on)	Sadar Jalandhar, District Police Commissionerate, Jalandhar

5. It is, *inter alia*, contended by learned counsel for the petitioners that the petitioners are innocent and have been falsely implicated in this case. They contend that no specific overt act has been attributed to the petitioners. Learned counsel representing petitioner-Manvir Singh @ Mangal contends that a representation qua his innocence has already been moved before the Commissioner of Police, Jalandhar, which is annexed with the petition bearing CRM-M-9224-2024 as Annexure P-3. As such, learned counsel representing the petitioners pray for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

6. *Per contra*, learned State counsel referring to the status report submitted by the State has categorically stated that so far as Annexure P-3 (annexed with CRM-M-9224-2024) pertaining to petitioner-Manvir Singh @ Mangal is concerned, there is specific affidavit filed by the Commissioner of Police, Jalandhar to the effect that the said representation has been inquired into and the same has been filed. He contends that the petitioners are alleged to have inflicted multiple injuries on the person of complainant-Dalbir Singh, Ranjit Singh and Sagar totalling 36 injuries with deadly weapons and also snatched the gold chains of Ranjit Singh and Sagar along with their mobile phones and cash. It is submitted that the custodial interrogation of the petitioners is required, as such, they do not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail.

7. Heard.

8. After considering the rival contentions and perusing the record, it transpires that as per the allegations, on 22.01.2024, the complainant-Dalbir Singh along with Ranjit Singh and Sagar were returning to their village after attending a marriage at Maple Leaf Resort, Village Manawali Phagwara, on their motorcycle. It is alleged that during the marriage function, one Vicky who is a saloon owner was doing the recce. When the complainant along with his friends crossed Village Daduwal, one Innova car hit them from back as a result thereof, they fell down on the road and 10-12 persons came out of the Innova car and one Hyundai i20 car armed with deadly weapons and they caused multiple injuries to the complainant and his friends and also snatched the gold chains of Ranjit Singh and Sagar besides

snatched their mobile phones and cash. The complainant identified Vicky (saloon owner), his brother Jaggi and one Mangal to be amongst the assailants, who had caused them injuries. Thereafter, the injured were shifted to the hospital.

9. As per the record, it has been found that the complainant-Dalbir Singh sustained 14 injuries out of which injury No.7 was declared grievous in nature, while Ranjit Singh sustained 13 injuries including injury Nos.7 and 8 to be grievous and Sagar sustained 9 injuries on his person with one injury being declared to be grievous in nature. Considering the fact that the petitioners had caused as many as 36 injuries on the person of the complainant as well as his friends including grievous injuries with deadly weapons and also snatched their gold chains, mobile phones and cash, the custodial interrogation of the petitioners is required to effect the recovery of articles as well as weapons used in the crime.

10. Therefore, keeping in view the nature and gravity of offence, it is observed that no case is made out in favour of the petitioners for grant of anticipatory bail, as a consequence, all the petitions are hereby dismissed.

11. Any observation made above shall not be construed as opinion of this Court on the merits of the case.

(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE

19.04.2024
S.Sharma(syr)

i)	Whether speaking/reasoned?	Yes/No
ii)	Whether reportable?	Yes/No