



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

214

CRM-M-23556-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 28.05.2025

DEEPU KUMAR

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY

Present : Mr. Ramanjeet Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. K.D. Sachdeva, DAG Punjab.

SANJIV BERRY, J. (ORAL)

- 1. Status report dated 15.05.2025 filed in the form of an affidavit of Assistant Commissioner of Police, Industrial Area-A, Ludhiana, is taken on record. Copy thereof has been supplied to learned counsel for the petitioner.
- 2. Arguments heard.
- 3. By way of present petition filed under Section 482 Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case FIR (Annexure P-1) as under:

FIR No.	Dated	Sections	Police Station
38	12.03.2023	323, 324, 148, 149, 506, 326 IPC	Focal Point, District Police Commissionerate, Ludhiana City

- 4. It is *inter alia* contended by learned counsel for the petitioner



that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the case. He contends that the petitioner was not named in the FIR but has been nominated in the supplementary statement of the complainant. He further contends the petitioner was not present at the time of occurrence, nor any specific overt act is attributed to him. He submits that the petitioner is ready to join investigation and has prayed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. *Per contra*, learned State counsel while referring to the status report submitted by State has opposed the petition on the ground that there is specific allegation against the petitioner of having caused injuries with his bat on the head of the complainant. He submits that the victim had suffered 10 injuries in the occurrence, wherein he was mercilessly beaten up by the petitioner and co-accused. He submits the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required to recover the weapon of the offence. Hence, prayed for dismissal of the bail petition.

6. After considering the rival contentions and perusing the record, it transpires that as per the case of prosecution on 09.03.2023, the complainant on receiving the information from his friend Mahesh Gupta that a person had slapped him and snatched his money in cricket ground, he along with Mahesh Gupta and his worker Shubam Verma went to the ground and asked him to return the money and apologize. In the meantime, 8-10 persons armed with weapons like iron datt, sword, and cricket bats came there and gave merciless beatings to them. The complainant was shifted to the hospital with 10 injuries on his person. Accordingly, the FIR was



registered. The petitioner was nominated in the supplementary statement of the complainant to have caused injury on his head with his bat.

7. A perusal of the record would reveal that the complainant sustained multiple injuries in the occurrence and the recovery of weapon is yet to be effected from the petitioner. There is specific allegation against the petitioner of having caused injury on the head of the complainant.

8. Therefore, considering the serious nature and gravity of offence, it is observed that no case is made out in favour of the petitioner for grant of anticipatory bail, as a consequence, the petition is hereby dismissed.

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

(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE

28.05.2025
S.Sharma(syr)

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