

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

Criminal Misc.No.M-14742 of 2015 (O&M)
Date of decision: 10th August, 2015

Baljeet Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

Present: Mr. Birender Singh Rana, Senior Advocate,
with Mr. Gagandeep Rana, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. M.S.Sidhu, Addl. A.G., Haryana,
for the respondent(s)-State.

INDERJIT SINGH, J.

Petitioner Baljeet Singh has preferred the instant petition under Section 439 Cr.P.C., seeking regular bail in case FIR No.159 dated 31.03.2014, registered at Police Station Kharkhoda, District Sonapat, under Sections 148, 149, 323, 324, 326, 307 IPC.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner was earlier granted anticipatory bail in this case and he remained on anticipatory bail.

Notice of motion was issued. Learned State counsel appeared and contested this petition.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned State counsel and have gone through the record.

From the record, I find that it is a case of version and cross version and the cross version case is registered under Sections 326, 324, 354 IPC etc. As per prosecution version, the

petitioner was armed with 'farsa' and inflicted 'farsa' blow on the back of injured Vikram due to which he suffered fracture of spinal code. The petitioner is in custody since 09.02.2015, as argued. Earlier, he remained on interim anticipatory bail for about one year after the occurrence. This Court, vide order dated 15.07.2015, directed the respondent-State to get the present health status of injured Vikram after getting him examined from the Medical Board. As per the report of the doctor, there is no significant functional/Neurological deficit to the patient at present and he is doing his government job without any problem. It has also been brought to the notice of this Court that after framing of the charge, till now, no witness has been examined which means that the trial of the case will take long time. No useful purpose will be served by keeping the petitioner in custody till the disposal of the case.

Therefore, keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case and without discussing the facts of the case in minute details and without expressing any opinion on the merit of the case, the present petition is accepted and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds in the sum of ₹50,000/- with one surety in the like amount to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court.

10th August , 2015
mamta

(INDERJIT SINGH)
JUDGE