

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-39512 of 2019

Date of Decision: September 23, 2019.

Rajbir @ Gullu

.....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL.

Present: Ms.Aashma Gill, Advocate, for
Mr.Aman Pal, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr.Munish Bansal, DAG, Haryana.
Mr.Vivek Sakhun, Advocate,
for the first informant.

-.-

Anil Kshetarpal, J. (Oral)

The petitioner prays for concession of regular bail pending trial in FIR No.472 dated 20.12.2017, registered under Sections 302/323/324/452/506/34 IPC at Police Station Matlauda, District Panipat.

As per the FIR, the petitioner is not alleged to have attributed any specific injury to the deceased. The petitioner is in custody since 14.11.2018.

Learned counsel for the first informant stated that the petitioner has caused injuries with a sharp edged weapon, on the legs of the deceased.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has drawn attention of the Court to the opinion of the doctor, which is extracted as under:-

“After perusal of above mentioned report and treatment record of the said deceased, the board is of opinion that the cause of death in this case is injury described in the postmortem report and its complications in a compromised person of liver disease aggravated to acute liver disease with decompensated cirrhosis.”

Learned counsel for the petitioner has also informed the Court that initially 10 accused were sought to be implicated. However, after police, after investigation, has found that case is made out against only three accused, whereas names of remaining seven accused were mentioned in column No.2, for which now first informant has filed an application under Section 319 Cr.P.C. which is pending.

Conclusion of the trial is likely to take time. At this stage, it would not be appropriate for this Court to make any comments on the merits of the case, lest it may prejudice the trial.

Without commenting upon the merits of the case and after keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case, it would be appropriate to direct the petitioner to be released on regular bail. Accordingly, the petitioner is directed to be released on regular bail subject to his furnishing adequate surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/ Duty Magistrate.

Accordingly, the petition is allowed with the aforesaid directions.

September 23, 2019

mohinder

(ANIL KSHETARPAL)

JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No