



CRM-M-36811-2024

-1-

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

213

CRM-M-36811-2024

Date of Decision:- 05.09.2024

**Amandeep Singh**

....Petitioner

Vs.

**State of Punjab**

...Respondent

**CORAM:-HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE AMARJOT BHATTI**

Present:- Mr. Sukhbir Maandi, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

\*\*\*\*

**AMARJOT BHATTI, J.**

1. Amandeep Singh has filed anticipatory bail under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in FIR No.91 dated 14.07.2024, under Sections 118(2), 118(1) and 115 of The Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, registered at Police Station Khalra, District Tarn Taran.

2. As per the facts of the case, Gursharan Singh complainant gave his statement to the police that on 04.07.2024 at about 9:10 PM, he was returning home on motorcycle TVS bearing Registration No.PB-08FA-3745 and when he reached near Baba Kala Mahar Jee of Village Mari Megha, a Maruti car came from backside and hit his motorcycle, as a result he fell down. He asked the driver of the car as to why he hit his motorcycle. Amandeep Singh came out of the car armed with *datar* and attacked him. He has attributed several *datar* blows on the person of complainant. He raised alarm for help. On this his cousin Daljit Singh

**CRM-M-36811-2024****-2-**

reached on the spot and also raised alarm. People started gathering there and on this, the assailant ran away from the spot on his vehicle. With these allegations present FIR has been registered.

3. Learned counsel for petitioner argued that there is delay in lodging the FIR. In the Medico Legal Report, different version has been mentioned regarding the said occurrence. In fact injuries on the person of complainant are self inflicted injuries. He is ready to join the investigation. Therefore, his anticipatory bail application may be allowed.

4. Learned counsel representing State opposed the bail application. Status report is already received. It is pointed out that as per MLR, complainant suffered five injuries on his person. Present petitioner is specifically named and weapon of offence is yet to be recovered. Investigation is at initial stage, therefore, he is not entitled to be released on bail.

5. I have considered the arguments and have gone through the record. Present petitioner is specifically named. It is rightly pointed out by learned counsel representing State that weapon of offence is yet to be recovered. MLR indicates five injuries on the person of injured, out of which, one of the injury has been declared as grievous.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts, I do not find a fit case for anticipatory bail and the same is accordingly declined.

7. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, stand disposed of accordingly.

**05.09.2024***Sunil Devi***(AMARJOT BHATTI)  
JUDGE**

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