

225

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

**CRM-M-6501-2022 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 05.04.2022**

Rahul

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASGURPREET SINGH PURI

Present: Mr. Manvinder Singh Dalal, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ranvir Singh Arya, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

JASGURPREET SINGH PURI, J. (ORAL)

The present petition has been filed under Section 439 of the Cr.P.C. for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.642 dated 12.11.2021, under Sections 148, 149, 323, 324, 326 & 506 of the IPC, and Section 25 of the Arms Act, registered at Police Station Pundri, District Kaithal.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is in custody since 25.12.2021 and even as per the FIR itself the main accused was one Santosh with whom the complainant had some old enmity and the name of the present petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present FIR and this case has been planted upon the petitioner. He further submitted that the petitioner is not involved in any other case and

has got clean antecedents and even otherwise also the investigation of the case has already been completed and after the presentation of challan under Section 173 of the Cr.P.C., the charges have also been framed by the learned trial Court. He also submitted that no recovery is to be effected from the petitioner and the trial of the case may take long time, therefore, he may be considered for the grant of regular bail. He further submitted that even otherwise the role attributable to the petitioner was that he had given a *lathi* blow and injuries caused were blunt.

On the other hand, Mr. Ranvir Singh Arya, learned Additional Advocate General, Haryana, has submitted that it is correct that the petitioner is in custody since 25.12.2021 and investigation of the case has already been completed and after presentation of challan under Section 173 of the Cr.P.C., the charges have also been framed by the learned trial Court. He further submitted that it is also correct that the petitioner is not involved in any other case and no recovery is to be effected from the petitioner.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

The investigation of the present case has already been completed and the charges have also been framed. The petitioner is not involved in any other case and the role attributable to the petitioner was that he had given a *Lathi* blow to the injured. The trial of the case may take long time and no recovery is to be effected from the petitioner, and therefore, this Court deems it fit and proper to grant bail to the petitioner.

Consequently, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on furnishing bail bond/surety bond to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in

any other case.

However, anything observed hereinabove shall not be treated as an expression of opinion on merits of the case and is only meant for the purpose of decision of present petition.

05.04.2022

Bhumika

(JASGURPREET SINGH PURI)
JUDGE

- | | |
|-------------------------------|--------|
| 1. Whether speaking/reasoned: | Yes/No |
| 2. Whether reportable: | Yes/No |