

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

CRM-M No. 11829 of 2016 (O&M)

Date of decision: 12.04.2016

Baljit Singh @ Balli

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. K.G. Chaudhry, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Mehardeep Singh, Addl. AG, Punjab.

Mr. L.S. Sekhon, Advocate for the complainant.

Jitendra Chauhan, J. (Oral)

By filing the present petition under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, the petitioner has sought regular bail in case FIR No.197, dated 18.12.2013, registered under Sections 302, 323 and 341 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code (for short 'IPC'), at Police Station Sadar, District Ludhiana.

The learned counsel for the petitioner refers to the certain contradictions in the statement of the complainant, Jaspreet Kaur, to contend that the petitioner was not present on the spot at the time of

incident. The petitioner is in custody since 18.12.2013.

On the other hand, the learned State counsel opposes the bail application.

Heard.

There are specific allegations against the petitioner in the FIR. There is no delay in lodging the FIR. If certain discrepancies or contradictions have figured in the statement of the complainant, the same shall be appreciated by the trial Court at an appropriate stage. At this stage, this Court is not inclined to comment upon the merits of the case.

Dismissed.

However, keeping in view the fact that the petitioner is in custody since 18.12.2013 and out of total 31 witnesses, only 13 have been examined so far, the trial Court is directed to conclude the trial, expeditiously, preferably within six months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

12.04.2016

sumit.k

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE