



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

102

CRM-M-26279-2024
Date of Decision: May 24, 2024

Sanjeev Kumar and anotherPetitioner(s)

Vs.

State of PunjabRespondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUDEEPTI SHARMA

Present: Mr. Abhishek Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Anil Bansal, DAG, Punjab

Mr. Divjot Singh Chadha, Advocate
for the complainant.

SUDEEPTI SHARMA.J. (ORAL)

The present petition has been filed under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners in case FIR No.120 dated 13.11.2023, under Sections 323, 324, 354-B, 34 IPC (Sections 304, 308 IPC were added later on vide D.D.R No.16 dated 14.12.2023 and D.D.R No.38 dated 29.01.2024), registered at Police Station Maqsudan, District Jalandhar Rural (Punjab).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that no specific injuries had been attributed to the petitioners and they have been falsely implicated in the present case because of some land dispute between the petitioners and the complainant.

3. Learned counsel for the State submits that FIR was registered under Section 304 IPC and now Section 302 IPC is added since the complainant has died



on 24.11.2023. He further submits that as per the report of the doctor, the cause of death is head injury, which is sufficient to cause death in the ordinary course of nature.

4. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record.

5. A perusal of the F.I.R shows that both the petitioners are the main accused and there are direct allegations against them, who caused death of the complainant.

6. In view of the above, no ground is made out to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

7. The bail petition is dismissed.

8 Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

(SUDEEPTI SHARMA)
JUDGE

May 24, 2024
sonia arora

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