

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

CRM-M-3555-2019

Date of decision:01.02.2019

Sarabjit Singh @ Sahib Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present: Mr. D.S. Virk, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Simranjeet Kaur, AAG, Punjab.

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner seeks grant of regular bail in respect of FIR No.303 dated 3.11.2018, registered at Police Station Patran, District Patiala, under Sections 307, 427 and 34 IPC and Sections 25 and 27 of Arms Act.
2. The FIR was registered at the instance of Lakha Ram wherein it has

been alleged that he is working as a driver in Bansal Car Palace, Patran, owned by Neeraj Bansal and that on the day of occurrence, when he after completing his work was returning back to Bansal Car Palace, Patran, then Sahib Singh (petitioner) who was having a revolver in his hand along with Mukhtiar Singh who was carrying a stick and one more unknown boy who was also having a stick suddenly came in front of his car. It is alleged that the petitioner fired a shot from his revolver with an intention to kill him hitting the left side front window of car. It is further alleged that petitioner also tried to give blow with stick on his car and the complainant being scared fled away in his car.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that in fact the parties have already resolved their disputes and have compromised the matter and a petition for quashing the FIR on the basis of compromise has also been filed. Learned counsel in this context has drawn the attention of this Court to order dated 3.12.2018 passed in CRM-M-53074-2018 wherein notice of motion has been issued and the counsel for the complainant has also put in appearance and has admitted the factum of compromise.
4. Learned State counsel while opposing the petition has submitted that in view the serious nature of allegations, no case for grant of bail is made out.
5. Having considered rival submissions addressed before this Court and bearing in mind the fact that it is a case of no injury and that the matter is also stated to have compromised, in my opinion, no fruitful purpose would be served by further detaining the petitioner behind bars

especially since the trial is not likely to be concluded in immediate future. The petition, as such, is accepted and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

6. This petition stands accepted accordingly

01.02.2019
Gaurav Sorot

(GURVINDER SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned / speaking? **Yes / No**

Whether reportable? **Yes / No**