

106 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-16074-2024
Decided on:-03.04.2024

Mohit Kewat @ Michael and anotherPetitioners..

vs.

State of PunjabRespondent.

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARKESH MANUJA

Present: Mr. Sandeep Arora, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

HARKESH MANUJA J. (Oral)

1. By way of present petition filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C., prayer has been made for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.76 dated 19.03.2024, registered under Sections 323, 148, 149, 452 and 506 IPC, at Police Station Rama Mandi, District Jalandhar.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that present is a case of version and cross-version and thus, the factum of aggressor is yet to be ascertained, as such, the petitioner deserves the concession of anticipatory bail.
3. Notice of motion.
4. Mr. Kewal Singh, Addl. A.G., Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State, whereas, Mr. Bharat Puri, Advocate appears on behalf of the complainants.
5. Learned State counsel assisted by Mr. Bharat Puri, Advocate representing the complainants opposes the prayer made on behalf of the

petitioner while referring to the injuries inflicted upon the victim.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and gone through the paper book. I am unable to find substance in the submissions made on behalf of the petitioner.

7. In the present case, a perusal of the FIR *prima facie* shows that incident in question was a result of pre-determined and pre-meditated attempt on the part of the petitioners and their other accomplices of giving multiple injuries upon the person of the injured/complainant as well as his brothers. In the incident, total 7 persons have been given multiple injuries and regarding 06 of them MLR have been prepared and most of the injuries are on the vital part of the body i.e. head. Thus, on cumulative analysis of facts and circumstances and the manner in which the offence is committed as well as considering the gravity thereof and also to further fair and free investigation, I do not see any reason to extend the benefit of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed.

03.04.2024
sonika

(HARKESH MANUJA)
JUDGE

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