

218

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-48119-2019
Date of decision-19.11.2019

Gurmeet Ram

....Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Mr. Sandeep Chopra, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Ramdeep Partap Singh, DAG, Punjab.

MANOJ BAJAJ, J.

Petitioner-Gurmeet Ram has prayed for grant of regular bail under Section 439 Cr.P.C in case FIR No.67 dated 23.07.2017 registered under Sections 307, 324, 341, 323, 506 and 201 read with Section 34 of Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station Banur, District Patiala. The petitioner is in custody since his arrest on 15.09.2019.

Murari Lal, complainant got recorded the FIR in question wherein it was alleged that on 21.07.2017, the complainant was planting vegetable in the field, adjacent to his field, Gurmeet Singh son of Bansi Ram along with his wife and mother were plucking vegetable in their field. Bansi Ram and his wife came to him and stated that due to insecticides used by him, his crop was destroyed. In the meantime, they started abusing him and Bansi Ram caught hold of him and his wife started giving slaps to him. Thereafter, accused Gurmeet Singh came there with a knife. In order to save

himself, the complainant tried to run away but he was apprehended by all the accused and accused Gurmeet Singh gave knife blow to him.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that there is version and cross version in the present case. He has invited the attention of this Court to Annexure P-2, i.e. MLR of the petitioner to contend that he along with his wife also suffered injuries. The petitioner suffered three injuries whereas his wife suffered two injuries. According to him, a criminal complaint bearing No.26/22-12-2017 has already been filed by his wife against Murari Lal and others. He further submits that the petitioner was granted the concession of interim anticipatory bail by this Court, however, later on said petition was withdrawn by the petitioner. It is further pointed out that charges were framed on 29.10.2019, however, not even a single witness has been examined so far. According to him, trial is likely to consume some time, therefore, further custody of the petitioner may not be required.

On the other hand, learned State counsel who is assisted by ASI Amrik Singh opposed the prayer. However, it is not disputed that the petitioner was extended the concession of interim pre-arrest bail, however, subsequently, the said petition was withdrawn by the petitioner. It is further apprised that in total there are 11 witnesses but no one has been examined and the next date before the trial Court is 22.11.2019.

After hearing learned counsel for the parties, this Court is of the opinion that trial of the case is likely to consume considerable time, therefore, further detention of the petitioner may not be justified.

Resultantly, without meaning any expression of opinion on the merits of the case, it is ordered that the petitioner be released on regular bail subject to his furnishing requisite bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court concerned.

The petition is allowed.

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

19.11.2019
vanita

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