



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-46721-2024

Date of Decision:- 06.11.2024

MANVEER SINGH @ MONU

....Petitioner

Vs.

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE AMARJOT BHATTI

Present:- Mr. Sumit Dua, Advocate for petitioner.

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

AMARJOT BHATTI, J.

1. Petitioner has filed instant petition under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.95 dated 20.08.2024 under Sections 333, 126 (2), 118 (1), 115 (2), 191 (3), 190, 351 (2), 324 (5) of BNS, 2023 registered at Police Station Division No.5, Jalandhar.

2. Facts of the case are that Sunaina @ Neha gave her statement that she is running parlour. On 18.08.2024 at about 2.30 pm gate of their house was closed. She was present in the house along with her mother-in-law Rekha when some boys started abusing and creating nuisance outside their house. There was camera in their house and they saw 5-6 boys present along with the girls namely Bhoomi and Laddu who lived in their neighbourhood. She along with her mother-in-law locked themselves inside the room. Said boys entered their house and started breaking articles.

One of the boy was shouting as to who had told his wife about his friendship with Bhoomi. They were holding kirpan and *dattar*. At that time Rupali Mehant was not present at the house. Said boys started giving kirpan and *dattar* blows on the door of their room where they were hiding as a result door opened and one of the boy gave blow with sharp edged weapon on her mother-in-law which hit on her head. People started gathering there. Said boys namely Monu and Amrit managed to escape. Thereafter she along with her husband Sahil took her mother-in-law to Civil Hospital, Jalandhar and then taken to Orthonova Hospital. With these allegations, present case has been registered.

3. Learned counsel for petitioner argued that petitioner is not specifically named nor any specific role is attributed to him. Allegations levelled by the complainant are false. Petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation. His anticipatory bail was wrongly declined by learned Sessions Judge, Jalandhar. He will abide by the terms of bail order. Therefore, his anticipatory bail application may be allowed.

4. Bail application is opposed by learned counsel representing State. Detailed status report has been filed. It is pointed out that present petitioner is specifically named. Said occurrence was caught in CCTV footage. In the occurrence, Honey, Sahil and Rekha suffered injuries and their MLRs are on record. Present petitioner is involved in as much as 15 FIRs which are detailed in para Nos.15 of the status report. In some of the cases, he was acquitted and in other cases he was convicted. He is yet to join the investigation. Therefore, he is not entitled to be released on anticipatory bail.

5. I have considered the arguments and have gone through the record carefully. Facts of the case indicate that present petitioner along with co-accused entered the house of complainant at night time armed with sharp edged weapons and attacked the entire family. Present petitioner is yet to join the investigation and weapon of offence is to be recovered. Status report indicates that even prior to this occurrence he was involved in several criminal cases. Considering the specific allegations and the fact that weapon of offence is yet to be recovered, I do not find a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail and the same is, accordingly, declined.

(AMARJOT BHATTI)
JUDGE

06.11.2024

snd

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No.

Whether reportable: Yes/No