



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

CRM-M-222-2025

Date of decision: 09.01.2025

Manjit Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KARAMJIT SINGH

Present: Mr. G.S. Saini, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. J.S. Dhaliwal, AAG, Punjab.

KARAMJIT SINGH, J. (ORAL)

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner seeking grant of anticipatory bail in a criminal case having FIR No.0037 dated 08.06.2024, under Sections 324, 323, 148, 149 of IPC (Section 326 IPC added later on) vide DDR No.020 dated 09.06.2024, Police Station Ghall Khurd, District Ferozepur.

2. As per the allegations recorded in the FIR, land dispute is going on between the parties and stay order was passed in favour of Sandeep Kaur daughter of the complainant with regard to land in question. On 02.11.2023 when complainant and his daughter went to their fields, it was found that petitioner, his wife Manjit Kaur and 10/12 unknown persons were harvesting crops growing in the land of the complainant party. The complainant tried to stop the accused persons from harvesting the crops. On this, petitioner raised lalkara and gave kapa blow in chest of the complainant. The other accused also attacked the complainant party.



3. The counsel for the petitioner inter alia submits that the petitioner is falsely implicated in the present case at the instance of the other party with which petitioner and his daughter are having civil litigation. It is further submitted that the FIR in question was registered at instance of the complainant in order to counter blast the said civil litigation. It is further submitted that the alleged incident took place on 02.11.2023 whereas the FIR was registered on 08.06.2024, after due deliberations to falsely implicate the accused persons including the present petitioner. It is further submitted that the complainant got himself admitted in a private hospital which was at distance of 35 kilometers from the place of occurrence while the government hospital were much nearer to the place of occurrence. The complainant did so in order to get manipulated the injuries on his person. It is further submitted that in the given circumstances, prosecution story seems to highly doubtful and that the petitioner who is having no criminal antecedents is ready to join investigation with the police.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. J.S. Dhaliwal, AAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the State and Mr. Kamil Nagpal, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of the complainant.

6. The State counsel and the counsel appearing on behalf of the complainant have submitted that the complainant and other injured were taken to the hospital immediately after the occurrence had taken place. That on 03.11.2023, application was given to SSP concerned by Sandeep Kaur, daughter of complainant with regard to aforesaid incident dated 02.11.2023.

The copy of the said application is taken on record. It has also been argued



that the injury caused by the petitioner with the help of sharp weapon in the clavicular region of the complainant was found to be grievous in nature and in this manner, the said injury is covered under the provision of Section 326 IPC. It is further submitted that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary to effect recovery of the weapon used by him in commission of crime.

7. I have considered the submissions made by counsel for the parties.

8. At this initial stage of investigation, pleas taken by counsel for the petitioner to establish innocence of the petitioner are of no consequence in the light of the fact that the petitioner is specifically named in the FIR and grievous injury caused with sharp edged weapon is attributed to him. The recovery of the said weapon used by petitioner in commission of crime is still to be effected. In the given circumstances, this Court is of the view that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary for the purpose of proper investigation.

9. In light of the above, the present petition is hereby dismissed. However, it is made clear that any observations made herein above are not to be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

09.01.2025

Yogesh

**(KARAMJIT SINGH)
JUDGE**

**Whether speaking/reasoned:-
Whether reportable:-**

**Yes/No
Yes/No**