

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

**CRM-M No.51019 of 2019 (O&M)**

**Date of Decision:24.02.2020**

Prince

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASGURPREET SINGH PURI**

Present:- Mr. Keshav Pratap Singh, Advocate,  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Gaurav Bansal, AAG, Haryana  
for the State.

**JASGURPREET SINGH PURI, J. (ORAL)**

The present petition has been filed under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure for the grant of regular bail in FIR No.196 dated 03.05.2019 under Sections 148, 149, 323, 324, 326, 307, 34 IPC and Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959 (Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959 was deleted during investigation) registered at Police Station Indri, District Karnal.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has, inter alia, submitted that the present FIR is a counter blast to the complaint, which the petitioner had filed against Saurabh, who is injured in the present case. Learned counsel for the petitioner has pointed out to the complaint dated 29.04.2019 (Annexure P-2) made to the police alleging that Saurabh had attacked him and he suffered injuries on his head and arm. The present FIR was lodged

on 03.05.2019, which was a counter blast to the aforesaid complaint. He has further submitted that even otherwise also, the investigation in the present case is complete and the other two co-accused, namely, Paras alias Chunu has been granted regular bail by the learned trial Court and Yogesh alias Chintu has been granted regular bail by this Court. Learned counsel for the petitioner has further submitted that the injuries attributed to the petitioner are by 'Gandasi', whereas role attributed to the other two co-accused is that they had fired in the air. Learned counsel for the petitioner has also submitted that the entire FIR was a concocted story in view of the fact that the petitioner had filed a complaint against Saurabh.

On the other hand, learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Naresh Kumar, has submitted that in the present case, it is correct that two other co-accused have been enlarged on bail. He has further stated that it is correct that the petitioner is not involved in any other case except the present one. However, the learned State counsel has opposed the bail on the ground that injuries were serious in nature.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

In the present case, the investigation of the case is already complete. It is the undisputed fact that the petitioner is not involved in any other case and both the other co-accused are already on regular bail. It is also not in dispute that the investigation in the present case is complete and the trial of the case has started and may take some time for final decision. Furthermore, it is not a case of the State that in case the petitioner is released on bail then there is likelihood that he may tamper with the record

or influence any witness. Therefore, I deem it fit to admit the petitioner to regular bail.

In view of the above, the present petition is allowed. It is ordered that the petitioner shall be released on bail on his furnishing bail bond/surety bond to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

However, anything observed hereinabove shall not be treated as an expression of opinion on merits of the case and is meant only for the purpose of decision of present petition.

**(JASGURPREET SINGH PURI)**  
**JUDGE**

24.02.2020  
sk

|                           |        |
|---------------------------|--------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned | Yes/No |
| Whether Reportable        | Yes/No |