

IN THE PUNJAB & HARYANA HIGH COURT AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-8281-2017

Date of decision : 01.05.2017

Hariom

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present: Mr.R.S. Hooda, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr.Sharad Kumar Yadav, DAG, Haryana.

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J.(ORAL)

Though in terms of the order dated 06.04.2017, learned State counsel has not been able to point to the testimony of the witnesses as a different counsel had appeared, however, learned counsel for the petitioner has produced in Court today the testimonies of the injured and the complainant, i.e. Amit and Subhash, the former stating to the effect that it was actually one Gopal who had fired shots that hit the aforesaid Amit; whereas as per the statement of the injured, Amit, it was one Chattar who had fired from a fire arm, resulting an injury to him.

He therefore submits that the petitioner in any case is not named in the FIR as a person who had fired the shot and both the material witnesses having been examined, there will be no purpose to keep the petitioner in custody any more, he having been in custody for more than 6 and a half months now.

comment upon the merits of the case, it is considered appropriate to admit the petitioner to bail, upon his furnishing adequate bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

May 01, 2017.
Davinder Kumar

Whether speaking / reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No