

216

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No. 54553 of 2023

Date of Decision:-18.01.2024

SATNAM SINGH @ SATTU

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

... Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY

Present:- Mr. R.K. Mathur, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Gurpreet Singh Sandhu, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. G.S. Dhot, Advocate for the complainant.

SANJIV BERRY, J (ORAL)

By way of the present petition filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C the petitioner is praying for anticipatory bail in the event of arrest in FIR (Annexure P-1) detailed as under:-

FIR No.	Dated	Sections	Police Station
185	11.10.2023	307, 379, 323, 341, 506, 427, 148, 149, IPC	Sadar Samana, District Patiala

2. It is *inter alia* contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in this case.

He submits that the petitioner was driver of the car only and no overt act has been attributed to him, as such he prayed for grant of concession of anticipatory bail.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for the complainant have assailed the version of the petitioner by submitting that there is CCTV coverage on the spot showing the petitioner actively participating in the occurrence thereby causing multiple injuries to the complainant. It is contended that in the occurrence complainant sustained 2 injuries on his head and as such the petitioner deserves no leniency, as such he does not deserve concession of bail.

4. After Considering the rival contentions and perusing the record, it transpires that as per the case of the prosecution the said occurrence took place on 09.10.2023 at about 8:30 pm when a car carrying 5-6 persons had hit the motorcycle of the complainant and altercation taken place, six more persons on motorcycle came there armed with weapons and caused multiple injuries on the complainant including injuries on the head. During the course of hearing the learned State counsel has shown photographs taken from CCTV coverage regarding the active involvement of the petitioner in the occurrence and also the photographs showing the badly injured condition of the complainant.

5. So taking into the account the serious nature and gravity of offence and also the fact that the recovery of weapon is yet to be effected, no case is made out in favour of the petitioner for grant of anticipatory bail, as a consequent the petition is hereby dismissed.

6. Any observation made above shall not be construed as opinion of this Court on the merits of the case.

(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE

18.01.2024
Gyan

- | | | |
|-----|----------------------------|--------|
| i) | Whether speaking/reasoned? | Yes/No |
| ii) | Whether reportable? | Yes/No |