

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

106

CRM-M No.21713 of 2024
Date of Decision: 02.05.2024

BALWINDER SINGH @ MINTA

.....Petitioner(s)

Vs

STATE OF PUNJAB

....Respondent(s)

CORAM: *HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARKESH MANUJA*

Present: Mr. Rahul Bhargava, Advocate
for the petitioner.

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 bearing FIR No.147 dated 01.09.2023 registered under Sections 302, 34 IPC at P.S. Kamboj, District Amritsar Rural wherein the petitioner has been implicated against the alleged murder of Bikram Singh @ Bikka.

[2]. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner was not present at the spot when fatal injuries were inflicted upon the deceased. He further submits that as per Panchayatinama signed by the neighbours, the presence of the petitioner was not at the spot and as such he was not involved in the incident relating to murder of Bikram Singh @ Bikka.

[3]. Upon advance notice, Mr. Athar Ahmed, DAG, Punjab appears on behalf of the respondent/State and opposes the prayer made on behalf of the petitioner while submitting that the petitioner was named in the FIR and a specific

role was attributed to him as regards serious altercation with the deceased on the date of incident being directly involved in the incident.

[4]. 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.

[5]. In the given facts and circumstances of the case wherein the petitioner has been specifically named in the FIR having serious altercation with the deceased on the date of incident and the petitioner was even accompanying co-accused Karam Singh @ Kalu at the time when deceased was given fatal injuries with datar blow on his neck. Moreover, under the similar circumstances co-accused namely Jaspal Singh @ Ghogha @ Sonu, who earlier approached this Court for the same relief, his prayer has been declined vide decision dated 13.03.2024 passed by this Court in CRM-M No.12831 of 2024.

[6]. In view of aforesaid in the humble opinion of this Court, the petitioner does not deserve the discretion of anticipatory bail in his favour. The petition is dismissed.

May 02, 2024

Atik

Whether speaking/reasoned

Whether reportable

(HARKESH MANUJA)

JUDGE

Yes/No

Yes/No