

CRM-M-21342-2021
Date of decision:07.06.2021

JOGENDER @ JUGGA

...PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

...RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIVEK PURI

Present: Mr. Manoj Tanwar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Aditi Giridhar, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Deepam Raghav, Advocate
for the complainant.

*(The case has been taken up through video conferencing on
account of Covid-19 Pandemic)*

VIVEK PURI, J. (ORAL)

Jogender @ Jugga-petitioner is seeking regular bail in the case bearing FIR No. 594 dated 13.01.2020 under Sections 148/149/323/506 IPC and (Sections 324/325/307 IPC added later on), registered at Police Station Mohindergarh, District Mohindergarh.

Briefly, the FIR has been registered on the allegations on 13.11.2020 at about 8:00 am, the petitioner alongwith the co-accused had inflicted injuries upon complainant. Subsequently, the assailants entered the house of the complainant and inflicted injury by means of knife in the abdomen of Jai Sharma son of the complainant.

It has been contended by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the injury under Section 307 IPC has not been attributed to the petitioner, he is not involved in any other criminal case, it is a case of version and cross-version though the version of the accused has been disbelieved by the police, Kailash co-

accused is on bail, injured has been discharged from the hospital, the investigation of the case is complete and the challan has already been presented in the Court.

On instructions of ASI Sushil Kumar, learned State counsel and learned counsel for the complainant have not assailed the aforesaid facts but have argued that there are serious allegations against the petitioner and Jai Sharma injured was discharged from the hospital after a period of more than one month.

Be that as it may, the case of the petitioner is more or less at par with Kailash, co-accused who has been granted bail by the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in terms of order dated 20.05.2021 passed in CRM-M-18557-2021. Moreover, the injured has been discharged from the hospital, the investigation of the case is complete, the conclusion of the trial is likely to take sometime on account of restricted hearing due to Covid-19 Pandemic and no fruitful purpose will be served by detaining the petitioner in further custody. In these circumstances, sufficient grounds are made out to extend the concession of bail to the petitioner.

Without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing requisite bail bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

The petition is allowed accordingly.

07.06.2021
renubala

(VIVEK PURI)
JUDGE

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