



CRM-M-42862-2024

-1-

221

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

CRM-M-42862-2024

Date of Decision:- 21.10.2024

Master Taranjit Singh (minor) through his mother

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM:-HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE AMARJOT BHATTI

Present:- Mr. Rituraj Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Kewal Singh, Addl. A.G. Punjab.

AMARJOT BHATTI, J.

1. Petitioner Master Taranjit Singh (minor) through his mother filed petition under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No. 94 dated 19.12.2023, under Sections 307, 341, 323, 324, 506, 148, 149 of Indian Penal Code, 1860, registered at Police Station Nurmahal Jalandhar, District Jalandhar.

2. As per the facts, complainant Gurdial Singh gave his statement that on 12.12.2023, he was coming on Platina motorcycle bearing registration No.PB08-EU-5270 from the well to his house. At about 5:30 PM, he was 1 KM away from the village when Amandeep Singh @ Lambar armed with *sword*, Satvir Singh @ Satti armed with *datar*, Taranjeet Singh armed with *sword*, Abbi armed with *datar*, Abbi's brother armed with *sword* and Taranjeet Singh's father Jasvir Singh armed with *datar* were standing there. They stopped their motorcycles in front of him



CRM-M-42862-2024

-2-

and Amandeep Singh raised a *lalkara* that complainant Gurdial Singh will not be spared. The aforesaid assailants attacked Gurdial Singh with their respective weapons. Petitioner Taranjit Singh has attributed two *sword* blows towards the head of complainant which the complainant warded off by raising his left hand. As a result, it hit on the fingers of his left hand. They all caused injuries to him with their respective weapons. In the meantime, his son Preet Singh Johal and his wife Harjeet Kaur reached there and on seeing them, the assailants fled away from the spot on their motorcycles with their respective weapons. In case his son and his wife did not reach there, they would have killed him. He was referred to Civil Hospital, Jalandhar and further admitted to Johal Hospital, Jalandhar.

3. Learned counsel for petitioner argued that there is delay of 07 days in lodging the FIR. Story put forward by the complainant is highly improbable. No injury has been declared dangerous to life or grievous. No offence under Section 307 of IPC is made out. Present petitioner was minor at the time of alleged occurrence. In fact he was attending his tuition class. Representation given to Senior Superintendent of Police, Jalandhar (Rural) is Annexure P-2. Tuition teacher of petitioner namely Geetanjali gave her affidavit in favour of present petitioner which is Annexure P-3. Petitioner is ready to join the investigation and abide by the terms of bail order. Allegations levelled against him are without any basis. Therefore, his anticipatory bail petition may be allowed.

3. Bail petition is opposed by learned counsel representing State. Detailed status report has been filed. It is pointed out that specific blows with *sword* are attributed to the present petitioner. In this occurrence,



CRM-M-42862-2024

-3-

complainant had suffered total 16 injuries. Even prior to this, complainant was attacked and it was second attack on the person of complainant. Present petitioner is yet to join the investigation. Allegations are specific and serious in nature. Therefore, he is not entitled to be released on anticipatory bail.

4. I have considered the arguments and have gone through the record. Present petitioner along with other co-accused armed with dangerous weapons attacked the complainant and caused him several injuries and his life was saved on the arrival of his son and his wife. As per the status report, injured received as many as 16 injuries. Present petitioner is specifically named who was armed with *sword* and attributed specific blows on the person of complainant. Injuries No.1, 5, 6, 7, 9 and 10 were declared grievous in nature and offence under Sections 325 and 326 of IPC were added vide DDR No.18 dated 24.12.2023. Challan has been presented qua Amandeep Singh and Satvir Singh and regarding remaining accused, after completion of investigation, supplementary challan will be presented.

5. Considering the specific allegations and the gravity of offence, I do not find a fit case for anticipatory bail and the same is accordingly declined.

6. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, stand disposed of accordingly as well.

16.10.2024

Sunil Devi

(AMARJOT BHATTI)
JUDGEWhether speaking/reasoned:
Whether reportable:Yes/No
Yes/No