



In The High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana
At Chandigarh

CRM-M-50380-2024 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 21.10.2024

Sahid ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Afjal Hussain, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. Munish Sharma, DAG, Haryana.
Mr. Ravi Malik, Advocate, for the complainant.

FIR NO.	DATE	POLICE STATION	OFFENCES
281	03.06.2024	City Palwal, District Palwal	148, 149, 324, 326, 506 IPC

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J.

1. The instant second petition has been filed on behalf of the petitioner seeking grant of anticipatory bail in respect of aforementioned FIR, the first having been dismissed as withdrawn on 24.09.2024.
2. The FIR was lodged at the instance of Sidhu son of Shafi wherein it is alleged that on 27.5.2024 at about 10:30/11:00 AM Yunus, Mustkim, Shahid, Inam, Aabu all sons of Irfan and Farukh, Mustakim sons of



Umardin, who were having enmity with the complainant attacked them with 'knives' and 'sticks' and a country made pistol. Although the complainant tried to run to save his life and Mustkin shot at him, but the same missed the complainant and did not hit him. It is alleged that accused petitioner entered his house and attacked his pregnant daughter-in-law and gave kicks and fist blows to her on account of which her condition deteriorated and was taken to hospital. It is further alleged that petitioner inflicted a blow to Istak with a knife hitting him on his left eye. The other accused also gave *lathi* blows to him. When Istak raised alarm, then Jakir, Teetu and some others from the neighbourhood were attracted to the spot and upon seeing them the accused fled away from the place of occurrence. Injured Istak was medically examined and the injury on the eye was opined to be a 'grievous injury'.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he has falsely been implicated in the present case and that it was much later that the injury has been declared a grievous injury and has apparently been declared so on account of manipulation.
4. On the other hand, learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for the complainant submitted that not only the petitioner is specifically named in the FIR, but a specific injury with the help of knife is attributed to him and that the injury inflicted by him to Istak



on his eye has been declared to be a grievous injury and thus the petitioner is not entitled for grant of anticipatory bail.

- 5. This Court has considered rival submissions addressed before this Court.
- 6. The petitioner is attributed an injury on vital part of the injured Istak i.e. on the eye with the help of ‘knife’ which is a lethal weapon. The injury has been declared a grievous injury. Under these circumstances and having regard to the manner in which the injury has been caused by the petitioner, this Court does not find any special case for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. The petition is sans merit and is hereby dismissed.

21.10.2024
mohan

(GURVINDER SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking /reasoned	Yes / No
Whether Reportable	Yes / No