

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

**109**

**CRM-M-12352-2020  
Date of decision : 14.05.2020**

Jasbir Singh @ Dhillla

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR TYAGI**

Present : Mr. Ankit Chahal, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Anmol Malik, D.A.G. Haryana  
for the respondent-State.

\*\*\*\*

**ARUN KUMAR TYAGI, J (ORAL)**

The case has been taken up for hearing through video-conferencing.

The petitioner has filed present petition under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 for grant of regular bail to him in case FIR No.69 dated 20.12.2019 registered under Sections 324, 326 and 506 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and Section 3 of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 at Police Station GRP Jind, District GRP Ambala Cantt.

Briefly stated, the above-said FIR was registered on statement of injured complainant-Vikram on the allegations that on 16.12.2019 he was going from Panipat to Jind. The petitioner-accused, who had consumed liquor, was abusing other passengers. When he asked him not to do so, the petition-accused inflicted screwdriver blow on his left eye and got down at Shiva Railway Station while threatening to kill him if he reported the matter to the police.

Copy of the petition has already been supplied to learned State Counsel who has opposed the same.

I have heard learned Counsel for the petitioner and learned State Counsel and gone through the relevant record.

Learned Counsel for the petitioner has argued that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the case by concoction and manipulation as there was undue and unexplained delay of 4 days in lodging of the FIR. The injury attributed to the petitioner was not dangerous to life. The petitioner is in custody since 24.01.2020. The trial is likely to take long time. No useful purpose will be served by detention of the petitioner in custody during trial. Therefore, the petitioner may be granted regular bail.

On the other hand, learned State Counsel has argued that the petitioner had caused grievous injury with screwdriver on left eye of the complainant causing permanent loss of vision to the extent of 80%. The petitioner does not deserve the concession of regular bail. Therefore, the petition may be dismissed.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case, nature of accusation as well as the fact that the trial is likely to take long time due to pandemic of Covid-19 but without commenting on the merits of the case as the same may prejudice the case of either of the parties, I am of the considered view that the petitioner deserves the concession of regular bail.

Therefore, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on furnishing of bail bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned.

14.05.2020

Kothiyal

(ARUN KUMAR TYAGI)  
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No  
Whether reportable : Yes/No