

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

**CRM-M No.16509 of 2016 (O&M)  
Date of Decision: 18.05.2016**

Sajjan @ Sajna

..... Petitioner

*Versus*

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASWANT SINGH**

Present: Mr. Dinesh Arora, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Poswal, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana  
for the respondent/State assisted by S.I. Shree Krishan.

\*\*\*\*

**JASWANT SINGH, J. (Oral)**

Present petition is for grant of regular bail under Section 439 Cr.P.C. on behalf of the petitioner/accused-Sajjan @ Sajna in case FIR No.81 dated 05.04.2016, under Sections 324, 452, 34 of the Indian Penal Code (for short 'IPC') and Section 3 of the S.C./S.T. Act, registered with Police Station Baroda, District Sonapat.

As per the allegations of the complainant-Pawan Kumar, on 05.04.2016 at around 8:00 PM, when he came to his house, he found that the petitioner/accused-Sajjan @ Sajna and co-accused Sonu Sarpanch tried to overpower his wife-Savita by calling her with casteist remarks. They were turned out of the house and thereafter co-accused/non-applicant-Suraj Bhan came there and inflicted Axe blow on the left shoulder of the complainant while the petitioner/accused also uttered casteist remarks.

It is contended that a false case has been foisted to put pressure on the accused party as the complainant concededly is facing a trial for the offence under Section 376, IPC for committing the crime against the daughter

Anu and co-accused Suraj Bhan. It is next contended that the co-accused Suraj Bhan, who inflicted the said injury, has been enlarged on bail and the petitioner has been denied the same solely on the alleged casteist remarks.

The petitioner is stated to be in custody since 08.04.2016 and after completion of the investigation, challan stands presented and evidence of 10 cited prosecution witnesses is yet to commence.

Learned State Counsel, assisted by S.I. Shree Krishan, does not refute the aforesaid factual situation.

Without commenting on the merits of the case, keeping in view the role attributed to the petitioner, custody period, parity of treatment and the fact that trial is not likely to be concluded in near future, this Court finds that petitioner/accused deserves the concession of regular bail and as such he is ordered to be released on bail to the satisfaction of CJM/Duty Magistrate concerned.

Disposed of.

**May 18, 2016**

Gagan

**(JASWANT SINGH)  
JUDGE**