

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

(206)

CRM No. M-33392-2020

Date of Decision : 02.11.2020

PREMJIT SINGH

....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

(through video conferencing)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present:- Mr. Hardawinder Singh Ghuman, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Sandeep Singh Deol, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

Harsimran Singh Sethi, J. (Oral)

The present petition has been filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C. for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No. 55 dated 20.04.2020, under Sections 307, 323, 148, 149 IPC (Section 325 IPC added later on), registered at Police Station Raman, District Bathinda.

Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that the injuries, which have been attributed to the petitioner, are upon the complainant, Navdeep Singh and though, five injuries have been attributed to him but all the injuries are simple in nature. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the challan has already been presented against the petitioner and, therefore, as no further recovery is to be done from the petitioner and the trial is likely to take some time to conclude, no useful purpose will be served in keeping the petitioner behind the bars, hence, the petitioner be granted the benefit of regular bail.

Learned State counsel concedes that the five injuries, which have been attributed to the petitioner, are simple in nature and no further

recovery is to be done from him as the challan has already been presented against the petitioner and one co-accused, namely, Gagandeep Singh. Learned State counsel submits that as per the allegations, the injuries which relate to Section 307 IPC, are attributed to co-accused, namely, Gagandeep Singh and Siltu Singh and not the petitioner.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record with their able assistance.

Once, the challan has already been presented and the petitioner has only been attributed the simple injuries and no role is attributed to the petitioner with regard to the injury, due to which, Section 307 IPC has been added, the petitioner has made out a case for the grant of regular bail as the trial is likely to take some time before it concludes and no useful purpose will be served in keeping the petitioner behind the bars.

The petitioner be released on regular bail in this case subject to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has undertaken before this Court to maintain a good conduct and not to influence any witness in any manner to scuttle the trial and in case of default of the above undertaking, the State will be at liberty to approach this Court for passing appropriate orders.

However, it is made clear that anything observed herein shall not be construed to be an expression of any opinion on the merits of the case.

November 02, 2020
kanchan/naresh.k

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking? *Yes/No*
Whether reportable? *Yes/No*