

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

CRM-M-42394-2020 (O&M)  
Date of Decision:- 19.3.2021

Mewa Singh ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ... Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL**

Present:- Mr. K.S.Chahal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Ajay Pal Singh Gill, DAG, Punjab  
assisted by ASI Jagjit Singh.

Mr. Tanvir S. Grewal, Advocate for the complainant.

*(proceedings conducted through video conferencing)*

\*\*\*\*\*

**GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J. (Oral)**

1. The petitioner seeks grant of regular bail in a case registered vide FIR No.75 dated 1.6.2020 under Sections 341, 323, 148, 149, 307, 302, 188 IPC at Police Station Chhajli, District Sangrur.
2. The FIR was registered at the instance of Amritpal Singh wherein it has been alleged that on 1.6.2020 at about 7:30 a.m. when Mewa Singh, Gurdev Singh, Satnam Singh, Charanjit Kaur, Mangta Singh Satti, Jodha Singh and Kewal Singh were standing near Dharmshala Street, then complainant's uncle Bhola Singh was passing through the street. The said persons attacked Bhola Singh. It is stated that Satnam Singh gave a blow with 'Gandasi' to Bhola hitting on his head, Satti gave a blow with chain on the right side of Bhola Singh's head. When complainant and his brother Gurdeep Singh tried

to rescue him then Kewal Singh gave a blow with stick to complainant's brother Gurdeep Singh. Mangta Singh is alleged to have given a blow with brick to Gurdeep. Kewal is also stated to have caused injury with stick to Gurdeep on his shoulder. Mewa Singh gave a blow with reverse side of '*Gandasi*', which hit in the center of complainant's head while Jodha Singh attacked him with brick. It is further submitted that Gurdev Singh and Charanjeet hurled abuses to them.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the instant case and that in any case even as per the FIR, the petitioner Mewa Singh is not attributed any injury to the deceased and is attributed injury to complainant Amritpal Singh from the reverse side of '*Gandasi*', which is a simple injury.
4. Opposing the petition, the learned State counsel assisted by counsel for the complainant has submitted that it is on account of the injury inflicted by the petitioner to Amritpal Singh that offence under Section 307 IPC came to be added and that as such, the petitioner does not deserve the concession of bail. The learned State counsel has, however, informed that the petitioner as on date has been behind bars since the last about 9 months and that he is not involved in any other case. It has further been informed that charges have been framed and that till date not even a single prosecution witness out of the cited 21 prosecution witnesses has been examined.
5. I have considered rival submissions addressed before this Court.
6. Keeping in view the fact that the peititoner is not attributed any injury to the deceased and is stated to have caused an injury to complainant Amritpal Singh from reverse side of '*Gandasi*' on his head and while noticing that the

petitioner in any case has been behind bars since the last about 9 months, further detention of the petitioner will not serve any useful purpose as the trial is not likely to be immediately concluded, given the fact that not even a single prosecution witness out of the cited 21 prosecution witnesses has been examined.

7. The petition, as such, is accepted and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned.

**19.3.2021**

kamal

**(Gurvinder Singh Gill)**  
**Judge**

Whether speaking /reasoned  
Whether Reportable

Yes / No  
Yes / No