

CRM-M-21732-2021

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

CRM-M-21732-2021

Date of decision: 22.06.2021

Manoj

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. S.S.Mor, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Upasana Dhawan, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Jagjeet Beniwal, Advocate,
for the complainant.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

Case is taken up for hearing through video conferencing.

Through this petition, the petitioner seeks regular bail in case FIR No.335 dated 06.10.2020, registered at Police Station Urban Estate Rohtak, District Rohtak, under Sections 323, 324, 506 and 34 IPC and Section 307 IPC (added subsequently).

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case; that moreover, there was no intention on the part of the petitioner to cause any injury to the complainant; that Section 307 IPC was added at a later stage; that a compromise dated 22.10.2020 (Annexure P-3) has been effected between the parties being residents of the same village, and that challan has been presented and the petitioner has been in custody for the last 05 months.

Per contra, learned State counsel opposes the prayer made in

CRM-M-21732-2021

the present petition. She, on instructions from SI Bijender Singh, submits that there are specific allegations against the petitioner and the injury on the person of the complainant, which has been declared dangerous to life, has been attributed to the petitioner. However, it is admitted that there is no other case registered or pending against him.

Learned counsel for the complainant does not dispute the fact that a compromise has been effected between the parties. Moreover, the petitioner and the complainant are the residents of the same village.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

The petitioner has been in custody since 24.01.2021. The matter has been compromise between the parties. Moreover, 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.

22.06.2021

parveen kumar

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?

Yes/No

Whether reportable?

Yes/No