

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

(210)

CRM-M-22263-2021

Date of Decision : June 18, 2021

Dilbagh Singh

.. Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.. Respondent

(Through Video Conferencing)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Mr. Satnam Singh Gill, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Narinder Singh Behgal, Assistant Advocate General,
Haryana.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI J. (ORAL)

Present petition has been filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in respect of FIR No.73 dated 12.04.2021 registered under Sections 148, 149, 323, 324 and 506 of IPC (Section 326 IPC added later on) at Police Station Ismailabad, District Kurukshetra.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has wrongly been involved in the present case and rather, the injuries attributed to the petitioner are self suffered. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that there is an animosity between the petitioner and the complainant and the complainant has already got other cases registered against the petitioner on the similar allegations, wherein the petitioner is already on bail.

Notice of motion.

Mr. Narinder Singh Behgal, learned Assistant Advocate General, Haryana, who has joined the proceedings through video conference, keeping in view the service of advance copy of petition, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State.

Learned counsel for the respondent-State submits that the injury, which has been attributed to the petitioner is grievous in nature and is on the hand of the complainant. Learned counsel for the respondent-State concedes that the investigation is over and the challan has already been submitted.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record with their able assistance.

Once, it has come on record that there is animosity between the petitioner and the complainant and the similar allegations were alleged against the petitioner on an earlier occasion also by the complainant itself and the petitioner has been granted the benefit of bail in those cases, which fact is not disputed by the learned counsel for the respondent-State, therefore, no useful purpose will be served in keeping the petitioner behind the bars in the present case as well as when the trial is likely to take some time before it concludes.

Keeping in view the above, the petitioner has made out a case for the grant of regular bail.

In view of the above and without commenting upon the merits of the case, it is directed that the petitioner be released on regular bail, subject to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

Learned counsel for the petitioner undertakes that petitioner will not influence trial in any manner including influencing the witnesses

and in case of default of the above undertaking, State will be at liberty to approach this Court for passing appropriate orders.

However, it is made clear that anything observed herein shall not be construed to be an expression of any opinion on the merits of the case.

June 18, 2021

harsha

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)

JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No