

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

Date of Decision: 08.07.2019

1) CrI. Misc. No.M-5070 of 2018(O&M)

Shingara Singh and others ...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab ...Respondent

2) CrI. Misc. No.M-6142 of 2018(O&M)

Maghar Singh ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present:- Mr. Dhawaljeet Dutta, Advocate, for the petitioners.
Mr. Rajat Bansal, AAG, Punjab

Amol Rattan Singh, J. (Oral)

By these petitions, filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C., the petitioners seek the concession of 'regular bail'.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that none of the three petitioners in CRM-M-5070 of 2018 and the single petitioner in CRM-M-6142-2018 have been attributed any grievous injury, with them having remained in custody now for the past 21 months.

He further submits that the complainant as also the doctors who were to testify (the latter in respect of the medical evidence), have all testified; but with 34 other witnesses still to be examined, the petitioners

deserve the concession of bail.

Learned State counsel while opposing the bail could not deny that the petitioners have been attributed only simple injuries though Maghar Singh has been attributed such injury on the hand of the deceased.

The factum of the complainant as also the doctors having been examined is also not denied by the learned State counsel, on instructions from the police official who is present in Court to assist him.

That being so, I deem it appropriate to admit the petitioners to bail during the pendency of the trial.

Consequently, without making any comment on the actual merit of the case, for or against the petitioners, these two petitions are allowed. The petitioners in both the petitions would be enlarged on bail, upon their furnishing adequate bail and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

08.07.2019
vcgarg/dinesh

(Amol Rattan Singh)
Judge

Whether reasoned/speaking: Yes
Whether reportable: no