

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

CRM-M-45511-2021

Date of decision: **03.11.2021**

MOHAMMAD ABRAR ALIAS BABLU

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE KARAMJIT SINGH

Present: Mr. Sunny K. Singla, Advocate
for the petitioner.

(Proceedings conducted through video conferencing).

KARAMJIT SINGH, J. (ORAL)

Present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 439 Cr.P.C. for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.120 dated 2.9.2021 registered under Sections 307, 341, 148, 149, 120-B at Police Station City-I, Malerkotla, District Sangrur.

Mr. Tanvir Joshi, AAG, Punjab, who is having advance copy of the petition has appeared on behalf of respondent No.1-State, whereas Mr. Mahipal Singh Yadav, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of respondent No.2-complainant.

The counsel for the petitioner contended that no injury has been attributed to the petitioner who has been arrested in this case on 6.10.2021 and is presently lodged in judicial custody. The counsel for the petitioner further contended that even otherwise compromise has been

effected between the parties and he prayed for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

The State counsel while contesting the bail application submitted that the petitioner was named in the FIR and was attributed specific role in his statement by the complainant, which was recorded by the police at the time of registration of the FIR.

The counsel for respondent No.2 admitted the fact that no injury has been attributed to the petitioner. He further admitted that compromise has already been effected between the parties and the copy of the same is Annexure P-2.

I have considered the submissions made by the counsel for the parties.

As per the FIR, which was registered on the basis of the statement of complainant-respondent No.2, one Prince caused injury on the person of respondent No.2 with *Dah* and the said accused was accompanied by Hasim, Aman and Arsh. As per the FIR, no injury has been attributed to the petitioner, who is stated to be in custody since 6.10.2021. As has been admitted by counsel for respondent No.2, it appears that the parties have already effected compromise and copy of compromise deed is Annexure P-2. Also there is no dispute regarding the fact that respondent No.2 who sustained injuries at the time of occurrence has been discharged from the hospital in a satisfactory condition. As per the custody certificate, the petitioner is having no previous history of crime.

In view of the above, I am of the view that no purpose will be served even if the petitioner is kept behind the bars for any longer period. Accordingly, without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is directed to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail / surety bonds to the satisfaction of concerned CJM/Duty Magistrate.

03.11.2021

Gaurav Sorot

**(KARAMJIT SINGH)
JUDGE**Whether reasoned / speaking? **Yes / No**Whether reportable? **Yes / No**