



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

104

CRM-M-27675-2024
Date of decision: May 29th, 2024

Harjeet Singh and another
.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab
.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Deepak Aggarwal, Advocate
for the petitioners.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J.

Petitioners are seeking the concession of anticipatory bail under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 in case FIR No.51 dated 30.04.2024 under Sections 307, 325, 323, 341, 427, 148, 149 of the IPC registered at Police Station Sadar, Bathinda.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in the instant case on account of some political rivalry between them. While drawing the attention of this Court to the DDR dated 19.04.2024 and the FIR, which have been annexed as Annexures P-1 and P-2 respectively, learned counsel submits that the false implication of the petitioners is evident from the fact that the complainant initially got recorded the DDR on 19.04.2024, which too was after two days of the alleged occurrence and no specific injuries were attributed to the petitioners therein. However, on 30.04.2024, the complainant made another statement to the police, leading to the registration of the FIR in question against the petitioners and co-accused. It has been further submitted that the complainant has given a fabricated version by twisting the true facts. Totally false

allegations have been levelled that both the petitioners along with the co-accused inflicted injuries upon the complainant side. Learned counsel has submitted that there was no immediate opinion of the doctor declaring the injuries to be dangerous to life and it was much later that an offence under Section 307 of the IPC was added without there being any medical evidence to support the said allegations.

3. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioners and perused the relevant material on record.

4. A perusal of the FIR, which has been annexed as Annexure P-2, reveals that it was a premeditated attack carried out by all the accused including the petitioners, who were armed with iron rods and wooden logs. The accused including the petitioners targeted vital parts of the body of the complainant including his head. On account of the attack, the complainant sustained multiple injuries including fractures and one of the injured also had to undergo a procedure involving 18 stitches on his head. *Prima facie*, there are serious and specific allegations against the petitioners, for which they do not deserve to be extended the concession of anticipatory bail.

5. The instant petition, therefore, stands dismissed.

6. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

May 29th, 2024

Puneet

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes

Whether reportable : No