



CRM-M-43503-2024

-1-

215

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

CRM-M-43503-2024

Date of Decision:- 22.10.2024

Chetan

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM:-HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE AMARJOT BHATTI

Present:- Mr. Kamaljit Singh Dhillon, Advocate
for the petitioner.

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

AMARJOT BHATTI, J.

1. Petitioner Chetan has filed petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No. 74 dated 25.05.2022, under Sections 324, 452, 148, 149, 380 of Indian Penal Code, 1860 (Section 326 of IPC was added later on), registered at Police Station Division No.4, District Police Commissionerate Jalandhar.

2. As per the facts of the case, Deepak Kumar complainant gave his statement that he is running a tea stall. At about 2:00 PM, he was taking rest when 06 unknown persons came and attacked him. He was caused injuries with *datar*. Said unknown persons were with muffled faces and they had come on two activa. After causing injuries they took away his mobile phone and cash of Rs.72,000/-. With these allegations, present FIR has been registered.

3. Learned counsel for petitioner argued that petitioner is falsely implicated in this case. No specific role is attributed to him. Other co-accused namely Kunal, Prince Kumar, Ranjam @ Ritik and Sanju Bhatti @



CRM-M-43503-2024

-2-

Jhajju have been granted anticipatory bail. Copy of orders are Annexure P-3 to P-9. He is also ready to join the investigation and abide by the terms of bail order.

3. Bail petition is opposed by learned counsel representing State. Detailed status report has been filed. It is alleged that during investigation it came into light that mobile phone of complainant, purse and cash of Rs.72,000/- are in the knowledge of present petitioner. He is yet to join the investigation and aforesaid articles are yet to be recovered. Therefore, present petitioner is not entitled to be released on anticipatory bail.

4. I have considered the arguments and have gone through the record. As per the facts of the case, complainant alleged that 06 persons with muffled faces attacked him and they caused injuries to him. They took away his mobile phone and cash of Rs.72,000/-. Name of the assailants came into light during investigation. It is a matter of record that aforesaid persons were granted anticipatory bail. However, as per the status report, articles to be recovered are in the knowledge of present petitioner. Therefore, his custodial interrogation is required.

5. In the light of facts narrated in the status report and the gravity of offence, I do not find a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail and the same is accordingly declined.

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

22.10.2024

Sunil Devi

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