

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

CRM -M-11392 of 2017 (O&M)

Date of decision: 07.04.2017

Ravinder

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN**

Present: Mr. N.K. Jaglan, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Saurabh Mohunta, DAG, Haryana.

\*\*\*\*

**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. 700 dated 03.11.2016, registered under Sections 148, 323, 324, 341, 326 read with Section 149 of IPC and Section 25 of Arms Act, at Police Station Samalkha, District Panipat.

The learned counsel refers to FIR to contend that no injury has been attributed to the petitioner. The petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He is in custody since 23.02.2017.

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

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

Considering the fact that no injury has been attributed to

the petitioner; he is in custody since 23.02.2017; the challan stands presented; charges have been framed; out of total 11 PWs, none has been examined so far, therefore, it can be safely 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.

07.04.2017

*sumit.k*

**(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)**  
**JUDGE**

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