

226

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

CRM-M-4635 of 2017

Date of decision: February 21, 2017

Vikramjit Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.B. CHAUDHARI

Present: Mr. S.S. Sandhu, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Tanushree Gupta, DAG Haryana.

Mr. G.S. Sandhu, Advocate for the complainant.

A.B. CHAUDHARI, J (Oral)

Heard learned counsel for the rival parties and perused the
FIR.

In FIR No.851 dated 24.09.2016, under Sections 307, 232,
506, 34 of Indian Penal Code, 1860 and Sections 25, 27 of Arms Act,
1959, registered at Police Station Sadar Karnal, the petitioner seeks
regular bail.

Learned counsel for the complainant opposes the petition
for grant of bail and submits that it is the petitioner who had fired the
shot which hit stomach of Ranjit Singh.

Learned counsel for the petitioner invites my attention to
page 10 of the petitioner, which is the sketch map and contends that
the dispute between the parties is regarding the passage leading to the
farmhouse and due to which dispute arose between the parties.

Petitioner was arrested on 26.09.2016 and is in jail since then. Petitioner resides at Karnal whereas, complainant-victim resides at village Darar, Tehsil Karnal which is 8 km away from the place of residence of the petitioner. Trial takes place at Sessions division, Karnal. Learned counsel for the petitioner, on instructions from the petitioner states that the petitioner would not enter the village Darar where the complainant resides.

Petitioner can be released on bail since the trial will take its own time, but with a condition as stated by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner would not enter the village Darar at all during the pendency of the trial nor would influence or tamper with the prosecution witnesses.

In that view of the matter, this petition is allowed. Petitioner be released on bail, subject to the satisfaction of the Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned, subject to above said conditions. Petitioner shall not tamper with the prosecution evidence, threaten or exercise any influence on the prosecution witnesses.

(A.B. CHAUDHARI)
JUDGE

February 21, 2017

mahavir

Whether speaking/ reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No