

204

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

Date of decision: May 18, 2018
CRM-M-11888 of 2018

Simran alias Simrandeep Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CRM-M-14214 of 2018

Rajwinder Singh @ Raju

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

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

Present: Ms. Riffi Birla, Advocate
for the petitioner (in CRM-M-11888 of 2018).

Mr. J.S. Grewal, Advocate
for the petitioner (in CRM-M-14214 of 2018).

Mr. H.S. Sullar, DAG Punjab.

Mr. Harjinder Singh Mavi, Advocate for the complainant.

A.B. CHAUDHARI, J (Oral)

By way of this common order, above said both the petitions are
being disposed of.

Petitioners, in both the petitions, seek grant of regular bail in
FIR No.120 dated 12.12.2015, under Sections 302, 307, 326, 148, 149 of
Indian Penal Code, 1860 (for short 'IPC') (challan presented under Sections
302, 307, 326, 323, 148, 149, 201, 115, 120-B of IPC) and Section 3(2) V
of Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribe (Prevention of Atrocities) Act,
1989, registered at Police Station Bahaw Wala, District Fazilka.

This Court had dismissed the petition for grant of regular bail

of both the petitioners, namely Simran alias Simrandeep Singh and Rajwinder Singh @ Raju, vide order dated 01.08.2017 and 11.07.2017 respectively. Thereafter, the trial proceeded and had been completed. However, at the end of the trial, an application was filed by Kaushalaya Devi and the prosecution, for summoning the person Akash son of Rajinder Kumar as a witness for the prosecution. This Court has heard the said matter and allowed the revision petition bearing CRR No.3063 of 2017.

With the assistance of the learned counsel for the rival parties, I have seen the evidence of PW19-Gurjant Singh, the victim and I find in his evidence that name of present petitioners, namely Simran alias Simrandeep Singh and Rajwinder Singh @ Raju has been specifically taken. The trial has been completed and the prosecution witnesses have named the petitioners as the persons who participated in the assault resulting into one murder and one very seriously injured. In my opinion, since the prosecution evidence has been completed and there is likelihood of culmination of trial and *prima-facie* case against the petitioners, there is no case for grant of regular bail to the them.

Hence, both these petitions, i.e. CRM-M-11888 of 2018 and CRM-M-14214 of 2018 stand dismissed.

(A.B. CHAUDHARI)
JUDGE

May 18, 2018
mahavir

Whether speaking/ reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No