



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

104

CRM-M-5986-2025

Date of decision: February 3rd, 2025

Vishal Singh @ Vishal

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Ashish Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioner.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J.

Petitioner is seeking the concession of anticipatory bail in FIR No.20 dated 03.05.2024 under Sections 326, 324, 323, 341, 148, 149 and 427 of the IPC registered at Police Station Lakhewali, District Sri Muktsar Sahib.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case, which arises from an alleged altercation, wherein both parties sustained injuries. It is argued that the incident is a case of version and cross-version and that the complainant party was the aggressor, having trespassed into the house of the co-accused and set it on fire. In support, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that a *rapat* was lodged regarding the same occurrence at the instance of the accused party herein. It is further contended that co-accused Gurmeet and Kuldeep Singh have been extended interim bail by this Court.

3. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and perused the relevant material on record.

4. A perusal of the material on record including the FIR reveals that the allegations against the petitioner are both grave and specific. There is specific attribution qua the petitioner of having inflicted grievous injuries with a sword on the complainant's right hand fingers. The attack, which has been detailed in the FIR, appears to have been carried out in a coordinated manner by all the accused persons, who were armed with lethal weapons, indicating a *prima facie* element of premeditation. The role assigned to the petitioner in the occurrence in question is distinct from that of co-accused Gurmeet and Kuldeep Singh, as they have been attributed no specific injury much less on any vital part of the person of the complainant party.

5. Though learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that this is a case of version and cross-version, when specifically questioned about the injuries sustained by the petitioner and his side, it was conceded that their injuries were simple in nature. Furthermore, while it has been contended that the complainant party set fire to the house of the co-accused, strangely the report regarding this alleged incident was made to the police only on 05.05.2024 i.e. three days after the occurrence.

6. Given the gravity of the allegations, the nature of the injuries inflicted, and the apparent pre-planned nature of the attack, this Court does not deem it fit to extend the extraordinary concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the instant petition stands dismissed.
8. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

February 3rd, 2025
Puneet

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes

Whether reportable : No