

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

CRM -M-18565 of 2016 (O&M)

Date of decision: 26.09.2016

Vinod @ Golia

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. Atul Lakhanpal, Sr. Advocate with
Ms. Bably Kumari, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Saurabh Mohunta, DAG, Haryana
assisted by ASI Chander Pal.

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 FIR No. 133 dated 28.04.2014, registered under Sections 147, 148, 323, 324, 341, 307, 427, 506 read with Section 149 IPC and Section 25 of Arms Act, at Police Station Adampur, District Hissar.

It is contended that petitioner has been attributed gun shot injury, however, there is no corresponding injury noticed on the person of injured, Nand Lal. The petitioner is in custody since 27.07.2014. The learned counsel further states that due to political rivalry with local politician(s), the petitioner has been framed in a large number of FIRs. Out of total 12 FIRs, he has already been

acquitted in 05 FIRs. The similarly situated co-accused has already been admitted to bail.

On the other hand, learned State counsel opposes the bail application and states that the petitioner who was armed with .12 bore country made pistol along with co-accused, Rajesh @ Kalia pulled out the complainant from the driving seat and caused injuries to the complainant. The petitioner is involved in a number of cases.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

Considering the fact that the petitioner is in custody since 27.07.2014; out of total 23 PWs, only 02 PWs have been examined including the complainant, therefore, it can be safely inferred that the trial is not likely to be concluded in the near future, without advertng to the merits of the instant case, this petition is allowed. The petitioners be admitted to bail during the pendency of trial, on their furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds, to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

Anything said herein above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

26.09.2016
sumit.k

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes	No
Whether Reportable :	Yes	No