

Satnam Singh versus State of Punjab

Present: Sh.Sarabjit Singh, Adv.counsel for applicant.
Sh.Amarjit Syal, Addl.PP for the State.

1) This order of mine shall dispose of first anticipatory bail application filed by applicant in the FIR No.122 dated 24.6.2020, u/s 326 IPC, PS Sadar, Bathinda.

2) Ld.counsel for the applicant has submitted that applicant has been falsely implicated. The version of the prosecution is highly improbable when the complainant party is not aware of applicant and are not known to him. He has prayed for acceptance of the bail application.

3) On the other hand, Ld.APP has opposed the bail application alleging that grievous injuries has been attributed to the applicant and he deserves no concession of anticipatory bail. He has prayed for the dismissal of the bail application.

4) Perusal of the file reveals that this case has been registered on the statement of Gursewak Singh on the allegations that accompanied by his brother Jashandeep Singh and mother Sukhwinder Kaur, they were sowing paddy in the fields of Raja Singh, who had given land on lease to Sukhdev Singh that at about 7.30 p.m., a person came drunk and offered to drop them home on the tractor of Sukhev Singh including their ladies, but they evaded. On 23.6.2020, at 6.00 p.m., complainant was sitting on the motor with his family and Sukhdev Singh when the same person came again drunk and he

exhorted that he is Satnam Singh @ Sattu, member panchayat and how dare he abuse him. He attacked his brother Jashandeep Singh with a spade but he intervened and the blow fell on his left arm and the said person Satnam Singh @ Sattu fled.

5) The injury on the person of complaint Gursewak Sihngah was declared to be grievous and the FIR itself was registered u/s 326 IPC.

6) The version of the prosecution shows that complainant was not known to the person who had come drunk and as argued by counsel for the applicant and the version on record, it is evident that in fact, applicant had himself disclosed his name before inflicting injury on the complainant. So, in the circumstances of the case and the version of the prosecution, I find that custodial interrogation of applicant is not required, especially when personal identity of applicant was not known to the complainant. Hence, the applicant is directed to join investigation with the Investigating Officer within 3 days and to cooperate in it. In that eventuality, he will be released on interim bail by the arresting officer on furnishing of bail bonds to his satisfaction. Applicant shall comply with the conditions under section 438(2) Cr.P.C. Copy of this order be sent to the concerned quarter. Now to come up on 31.7.2020 for awaiting outcome of the investigation after joining investigation by the accused/ applicant.

**Pronounced:
Dt.27.07.2020.**

**(Sanjeeta),
Addl. Sessions Judge(D),
Bathinda(UID:PB0177).**

Kulwinder Singh,
Stenographer-II