



105

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-23225-2024

Date of decision: 09.05.2024

Dinesh Kumar

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR**Present:** Mr. Mohan Singh Chauhan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Geeta Sharma, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Suvir Sidhu, Advocate
for the complainant.**HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)**

The present petition has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. seeking anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No.121 dated 23.02.2024 (Annexure P-1/T) under Sections 332/333/353/354/506/34 of IPC registered at Police Station Gharaunda, District Karnal, Haryana.

Mr. Suvir Sidhu, Advocate puts in appearance on behalf of the complainant and files his power of attorney which is taken on record.

Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that on 18.09.2023, a meeting of the Board of Management Committee was held under the Chairmanship of Principal in which a complaint made by some of the students against the petitioner was considered and vide resolution No.4, it was found that the complaint was baseless and it was further decided that petitioner being President of the School Management Committee, will keep on visiting the



CRM-M-23225-2024

-2-

school. It is further contended that the petitioner has only acted in the interest of discipline and used to ask the Teachers not to carry their mobile phones while on duty and due to this reason, the FIR (*supra*) has been registered against the petitioner and no specific injury has been caused by the petitioner.

Per contra, the learned State counsel assisted by Mr. Suvir Sidhu, Advocate for the complainant, opposes the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner on the ground that the petitioner is accused of offence under Section 333 of IPC in which he has caused injury to a public servant and complainant being a lady teacher was inflicted injuries and the entire incident was captured in a mobile phone. It is further contended that the petitioner has been sending WhatsApp messages without any justifiable cause and he is a habitual offender and involved in two more cases.

Having heard learned counsel for the parties and after perusing the record, this Court finds no ground to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner and keeping in view the allegations contained in the FIR, his custodial interrogation is imperative.

In view of the above, the present petition stands dismissed accordingly.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

09.05.2024
Neha

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