

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

CRM-M-35542 of 2019  
Date of Decision: 04.09.2019

Sanjay Rawat

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

**CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU**

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

Mr. Harpreet Singh Multani, AAG, Punjab.

\*\*\*\*\*

**MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU, J.(Oral)**

Present petition has been filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C. seeking bail pending trial in case FIR No. 19 dated 29.01.2019, under Sections 323, 324, 326, 307, 451, 506, 148 and 149 of the Indian Penal Code, registered at Police Station Division No.6, Jalandhar.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that neither petitioner was named in the FIR; nor any injury has been attributed to him. Further contends that the co-accused-Ajay Kumar has already been granted the concession of regular bail by this Court vide order dated 18.07.2019. Also contends that after investigation in the matter report under Section 173 Cr.P.C. has already been submitted and charges were framed on 06.07.2019. Further argued that the petitioner is in custody since 29.01.2019 and nothing incriminating has been recovered from him. Also argued that there is no other criminal case

pending against the petitioner.

The above factual position is duly acknowledged by learned State counsel on instructions from the police official.

Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the paper book.

Since there is no injury attributed to the petitioner and the prosecution evidence is yet to start. Petitioner is in custody since 29.01.2019, the report under Section 173 Cr.P.C. has already been submitted and there is no other criminal case pending against him. Since the trial is likely to take a long time to be concluded and as such no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind the bars any more.

In view of the abovesaid circumstances, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, this petition is accepted. Petitioner-Sanjay Rawat be admitted to bail on his furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

However, it is made clear that above observations may not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merit of the case pending before learned trial Court.

**[MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU]**  
**JUDGE**

September 04, 2019

*rashmi*

Whether speaking/reasoned  
Whether reportable?

Yes/no  
Yes/no