

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

CRM -M-37366 of 2016 (O&M)

Date of decision: 25.10.2016

Mohd. Saleem

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. G.N. Malik, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Mehardeep Singh, Addl. A.G., Punjab
assisted by HC Balbir Singh.

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. 21 dated 04.03.2016, registered under Section 307 read with Section 34 of IPC and Section 25 of Arms Act, at Police Station City-I Malerkotla, District Sangrur.

It is contended that two gun shots injuries have been attributed to the petitioner whereas one gun shot has been attributed to the complainant's wife, however, there is no medical evidence corroborating the version reflected in the FIR. The petitioner is in custody since 05.03.2016.

On the other hand, the learned State counsel opposes the

bail application and states that as per report, it has been opined that injuries suffered may be the result of gun shot.

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

Considering the fact that injuries attributed to the petitioner are simple in nature; he is in custody since 05.03.2016; out of total 21 PWs, none has been examined so far; therefore, it can safely be inferred that the trial is not likely to be concluded in the near future, without adverting to the merits of the instant case, this petition is allowed. The petitioner be admitted to bail during the pendency of trial, on his 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.

25.10.2016
sumit.k

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

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