

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

CRM-M-7362-2021

Date of decision:24.02.2021

Lovepreet Singh @ Raja

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Jasraj Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Ramandeep Sandhu, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

Mr. H.S. Randhawa, Advocate for the complainant and injured.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

Case is taken up for hearing through video conferencing.

Through this petition under Section 439 Cr.P.C., the petitioner seeks regular bail in case bearing FIR No.251 dated 25.10.2020 registered under Sections 307, 34 IPC and Section 25 of the Arms Act at Police Station Dasuya, District Hoshiarpur.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that the allegations levelled against the petitioner, aged 18-1/2 years, are that he had snatched the rifle of his father-Tarsem Singh, co-accused and inflicted injuries on the complainant and his mother, which are simple in nature, but thereafter the Doctor had given an opinion that the possibility of the injury being dangerous to the life cannot be ruled out. Since the parties are neighbours and the present FIR was registered on a haste, now a compromise dated 15.01.2021 (Annexure P-3) has been effected between the parties with the intervention of the neighbours and the respectables. It is further stated that

co-accused Tarsem Singh, father of the petitioner, has already been granted bail by this Court vide order dated 19.01.2021.

Learned State counsel, while opposing the prayer for grant of regular bail, states that the fire arm injuries have been attributed to the petitioner on the persons of the complainant and his mother. The challan has been presented but the charges are yet to be framed.

Learned counsel for the complainant and the injured appears and files his power of attorney on their behalf, which is taken on record. He does not, however, dispute the factum of the compromise.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

The petitioner has been in custody since 26.10.2020. Trial of the case would take time to conclude. Therefore, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind the bars.

In view of the above, without commenting anything on the merits, lest it should prejudice the case of either side, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

24.02.2021

ishwar

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

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