

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

**CRM-M-33300-2019**

**Date of Decision: 10.09.2019**

**Nitish**

**.....Petitioner**

**Vs.**

**State of Haryana**

**.....Respondent**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH**

**Present:** Mr. Keshav Pratap Singh, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Surender Singh, A.A.G., Haryana.

\*\*\*\*\*

**AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J. (ORAL)**

Learned counsel for the petitioner points to the fact that other than in the FIR (where the petitioner is in fact shown to be a person who was having a conversation with the complainant and two other persons by the name of Dharmender and Jaibir, when Manjit and Vikram had come and had started firing at the complainant), in his testimony before the trial Court also, the complainant stated the same thing, contrary to the statement alleged to have been recorded after the FIR was registered, in which the complainant is alleged to have named the petitioner as an accused.

A copy of the testimony of the complainant, Rajesh, having been annexed as Annexure P-1, with the petition, learned State counsel obviously could not deny the same.

That being so, without making any comment on the merits of the case, the petition is allowed. The petitioner shall be admitted to bail upon his furnishing adequate bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court.

**September 10, 2019**

**nitin**

**(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)**

**JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes

Whether Reportable

No.