

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

CRM-M-31139-2021

Date of Decision:11.10.2021

Banty Singh

.....Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

....Respondent

CRM-M-12953-2021

Surjit Singh

.....Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

....Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present: Mr. B.S.Toor, Advocate,
for the petitioner in CRM-M-31139-2021

Mr. S.S.Brar, Advocate,
for the petitioner in CRM-M-12953-2021.

Mr. Rana Harjasdeep Singh, AAG, Punjab.

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J. (Oral)

Case heard *via* video conference.

CRM-M-31139-2021

By this petition, the petitioner seeks the concession of 'regular bail' under the provisions of Section 439 Cr.P.C., upon FIR No.69, dated 19.05.2020, having been registered at Police Station Chajjli, District Sangrur, alleging therein the commission of offences punishable under Sections 307/323/148/149/120-B of the IPC.

It is to be noticed that the petitioner had earlier filed a similar petition, which had come up for hearing alongwith the petitions filed by two of his co-accused, and when this court was no inclined to admit the petitioner to bail, the attribution to him being of various injuries caused, that petition had been withdrawn on 07.04.2021, though the petition filed by one Babblu Singh (CRM-M-7321-2021), had been allowed on the ground that his name in fact had not appeared in the FIR originally and there was no other criminal case registered against him (though learned counsel for the petitioner submits that there is no other criminal case registered against the petitioner also).

He further submits that the petitioner, Banty Singh, has now been in custody for more than 1 year and 2 months, with the trial still not having progressed.

Learned State counsel, on instructions, does not deny the period of custody but as regards the trial he submits that the charge against him has been framed but with all 25 prosecution witnesses still to be examined.

He also does not deny that there is no other criminal case registered against the petitioner.

That being so, looking at the period of custody of the petitioner now, and the stage of the trial, without making any comment on the actual merits of the case, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be admitted to bail, upon him furnishing adequate bail and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the CJM/Duty Magistrate concerned.

CRM-M-12953-2021

In this case, the custody of the petitioner being less than 1 year and the attribution to him being of iron rod blows, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he does not press this petition at this stage.

Dismissed as withdrawn as above.

October 11, 2021

dharamvir

**(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : YES
Whether Reportable : NO