

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

CRM-M-29579-2019

Date of decision:19.7.2019

PARGAT SINGH @ PAGGI

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

.....Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present: Mr. Kamaldeep Singh Redhu, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ashok Singh Choudhary, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner seeks grant of regular bail in case registered vide FIR No.56 dated 5.2.2019, under Sections 148, 149, 307, 506 of the Indian Penal Code, Section 3(2)(v) of ST/SC Act and Section 25 of the Arms Act, Police Station Safidon, District Jind.
2. As per the FIR, lodged at the instance of Sagar, he was attacked by 15-20 persons, some of whom belonged to his village out of whom he knew Narinder @ Gibbu, Paggi, Ajay, Ravi Jogi, Chanda Saini and Kala Jhimar. It is alleged that Narinder and Ajay were having illegal weapons and Ajay asked Narinder to fire from the same and upon which Narinder fired a shot hitting the complainant who ran towards street.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the present case is in fact a case of cross-versions which came to be lodged due

to some misunderstanding and that in fact the complainant-Sagar had already furnished an affidavit (Annexure P-2) wherein the complainant has deposed that only Narinder Pal had fired a shot from his gun and none else was involved in causing injuries to him.

4. Opposing the petition, the learned State counsel has informed that since the petitioner is specifically named in the FIR whereas he is referred to as Paggi, no case for grant bail is made out. It is however informed that the present case is in fact a case of cross-versions and the petitioner has been behind bars since last 3 ½ months and that challan has already been presented.
5. Having regard to the aforesaid facts & circumstances of the present case and without commenting anything on the merits of the case and while bearing in mind that the present case is in fact a case of cross-versions and that challan has already been presented, in my opinion, no fruitful purpose would be served by further detaining the petitioner behind bars. The petition, as such, is accepted and it is ordered that petitioner be released on bail on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

(GURVINDER SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

19.7.2019
Gaurav Sorot

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

Whether reportable? **Yes / No**