

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

233

CRM-M-59434-2024 (O&amp;M)

Date of Decision:- 16.01.2025

**SHABAJ SINGH ALIAS SAHAJ**

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

**STATE OF HARYANA**

...Respondent(s)

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY**

Present : Mr. Pradeep Bhukal, Advocate for  
Mr. Kanhiya Soni, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Surender Singh, A.A.G. Haryana.

\*\*\*\*\*

**SANJIV BERRY, J. (ORAL)**

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:

<b>FIR No.</b>	<b>Dated</b>	<b>Sections</b>	<b>Police Station</b>
254	05.06.2024	323, 341, 365, 506, 34 IPC; (325 and 367 IPC added later on)	Civil Line, District Sirsa


2. 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 belongs to labour class and no specific role is attributed to the petitioner in the FIR. He submits that a compromise has been effected between the parties and in this regard, he has referred to the



affidavit given by the complainant annexed with the petition as Annexure P-3. He further submits that the petitioner is ready to join investigation, thus, prays for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

3. *Per contra*, learned State counsel while referring to the status report submitted by State has assailed these arguments by submitting that the petitioner along with co-accused had forcefully taken the petitioner to a remote place where he was mercilessly beaten. The petitioner along with co-accused armed with *lathis* and sticks gave multiple injuries to the complainant, which caused fracture on various parts of the body. He submits that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required to recover the weapon used in the commission of offence. Thus prays for dismissal of the petition.

4. After considering the rival contentions and perusing the record, it transpires that as per the case of prosecution, the complainant-Sanjeev Kumar recorded his statement to the police alleging that on 03.06.2024 at about 6/6:30 PM, when he and Lal Mohan were going to Auto market on the motorcycle of Lal Mohan, they were waylaid by Mithu and Sahaj (present petitioner) who came on a motorcycle. They forcefully took the complainant with them in a vacant plot, where co-accused Jashan Khattar was standing armed with a *lathi* stucked with nails. Mithu armed with baseball bat and Sahaj and Jashan Khattar armed with *lathis* gave multiple blows with their weapons and thereafter took the complainant to village Suchan Kotli, where two other boys armed with *dandas* were standing and all of them gave beatings to the complainant with their respective weapons. As per the MLR,



the complainant received as many as 12 injuries and injuries No.9 and 11 were declared grievous in nature. So far as the factum of compromise is concerned, the same would not come to the rescue of the petitioner as offences under Sections 365 and 367 IPC are not compoundable.

5. Therefore, considering the 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.

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

**(SANJIV BERRY)**  
**JUDGE**

**16.01.2025**

*S.Sharma(syr)*

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