



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

102

CRM-M-34985-2024

Date of decision: 24.07.2024

Manjeet @ Chintu

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present : Mr. Piyush Aggarwal, Advocate for the petitioner.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J.

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of anticipatory bail under Section 438 of the Cr.P.C. in case FIR No.132 dated 23.05.2024 under Sections 323, 325, 506 of the IPC (Section 326 of the IPC added lateron), registered at Police Station Sahlawas, District Jhajjar.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case; the FIR in question was registered after a delay of four days from the date of alleged occurrence. It has been further submitted that the parties are closely related to the each other, the complainant being the nephew of the petitioner. The petitioner had duly cooperated with the investigating agency throughout and granted bail vide order dated 28.05.2024, however, only on account of the strained relations between the parties, an offence under Section 326 of the IPC had been added after 40 days of the alleged occurrence. It has been further submitted that apart from



CRM-M-34985-2024

an injury on the eye of the complainant, there is no other visible injury, therefore, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner would not be required; the petitioner may kindly be granted the extraordinary concession of anticipatory bail.

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

4. A perusal of the allegations levelled against the petitioner in the FIR which has been annexed as Annexure P-1 reveals serious and grave allegations against him. The petitioner inflicted a grievous injury on the eye of his nephew i.e. the complainant; on account of the injury inflicted the complainant has lost vision of one of his eyes. In the facts and circumstances coupled with the manner in which the injury has allegedly been inflicted upon the complainant by the petitioner, this Court does not deem it fit to extend him the extraordinary concession of anticipatory bail.

5. Accordingly, the instant petition is hereby 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.

24.07.2024

Vinay

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

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