

219 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-51532-2019  
Date of decision-10.01.2020

Akashdeep Singh @ Akash  
Vs.

....Petitioner

State of Punjab

...Respondent

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ**

Present: Mr. B.D.Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.  
Ms. Monika Jalota, DAG, Punjab.

\*\*\*

**MANOJ BAJAJ, J.**

Petitioner-Akashdeep Singh @ Akash has prayed for grant of regular bail under Section 439 Cr.P.C in case FIR No.70 dated 30.06.2019 registered under Sections 323, 336, 341, 427, 506, 160 and 148 read with Section 149 of Indian Penal Code, 1860 (Section 307 IPC added later on) and Sections 25 and 27 of Arms Act, 1959 at Police Station Division No.1, Jalandhar.

The FIR in the present case was registered on the information given by secret informer wherein it was stated that Ishu resident of Sava Do Marle who was an auto driver had dispute with Sonu resident of Kalia colony, Jalandhar. Ishu along with his accomplices Vishal, Deepak, Rishabh and Kalu Nepali went to DAV rivulet near railway lines, where Sonu alongwith his accomplices were present. They all were armed with datar and iron rods. Sonu and his accomplices damaged the motorcycles of Ishu and others and after firing, both groups ran away from the spot with their respective weapons.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the allegations are founded on hearsay material and all the offences are bailable except the offence under Section 307 IPC. According to him, no person was injured in the said occurrence and it is seriously debatable if the offence punishable under Section 307 IPC is made out. He submits that allegations are false as none of the aggrieved party have lodged the FIR or had given any complaint. He further invites the attention of the Court to Annexure P-5 in respect of co-accused who has already been granted the concession of regular bail. According to him, investigation of the case is complete, therefore, further custody of the petitioner may not be necessary.

On the other hand, learned State counsel assisted by ASI Heera Lal opposed the prayer. However, it is not disputed that co-accused have already been extended the concession of regular bail. It is also not disputed that the investigation of the case is complete.

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 custody of the petitioner may not be justified, particularly when the investigation of the case is complete. 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.

**10.01.2020**

vanita

Whether speaking/reasoned :

Whether Reportable :

Yes

Yes

No

No

**(MANOJ BAJAJ)**  
**JUDGE**