

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

CRM-M No. 5845 of 2019

Date of Decision:-18.11.2019

SUNIL @ BOXER

.....Petitioner

V/S

STATE OF HARYANA

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR TYAGI

Present : Mr. Manoj Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ramesh Kumar Ambavta, AAG, Haryana.

ARUN KUMAR TYAGI, J. (ORAL)

The petitioner has filed the present third petition under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 28 dated 26.04.2018 registered under Sections 307/324/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and 25 of the Arms Act 1959 and Section 3 of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 at Police Station GRP, Sonapat.

First petition-CRM-M-47629-2018 was dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 12.11.2018 while on second petition-CRM-M-50267-2018, the petitioner was granted interim bail vide order dated 19.11.2018 by the coordinate Bench of this Court.

Learned Counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is a student of B.Com and has been falsely implicated in the present case due to personal enmity of the complainant with the petitioner.

Complainant alongwith his friends attacked the petitioner and the petitioner acted only to defend himself. The petitioner was arrested on 01.05.2018 and

since then the petitioner is behind the bars. The trial will take long time to conclude. No useful purpose will be served by keeping the petitioner behind the bars. The injured had criminal antecedents and was involved in four criminal cases.

Learned Counsel for the petitioner has accordingly prayed for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

On the other hand, learned State Counsel has argued that the petitioner had inflicted knife blow in the stomach of Ashwani which injury was declared to be dangerous to life. The petitioner has committed serious offences and in view of the gravity thereof, the bail application may be dismissed.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case, including the fact that the injury which was declared to be dangerous to life is attributed to the petitioner and also the fact that the trial can be expedited and is not likely to take long time but without commenting on merits, I am of the considered view that the petitioner does not deserve the concession of regular bail. Therefore the petition is dismissed. However, the trial Court is directed to expedite the trial.

18.11.2019

Rajeev (rvs)

**(ARUN KUMAR TYAGI)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No