

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

212

CRM-M-9524 of 2022

Date of decision : 10.03.2022

Ankit

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present:- Mr. Sumit Sangwan, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Kanwar Sanjiv Kumar, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Mohit, Advocate, for the complainant.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

The prayer in the instant petition filed under Section 439 Cr. P. C. is for grant of Regular Bail to the petitioner in respect of FIR No.0279 dated 30.09.2021 registered under Sections 120-B, 148, 149, 307, 323, 506 IPC (Section 325 IPC added lateron) at Police Station Dadri Sadar, District Charkhi Dadri.

Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that no specific role has been attributed to the petitioner. As per allegation borne out from the FIR, Section 307 IPC has been attracted only for the reasons that the assailants are alleged to have hit motorcycle on which the complainant was sitting with the pick-up van (Bolero). No injury as would attract Section 307 IPC sustained by the any of the victim/complainant. It is also pointed out by learned counsel for the petitioner that the parties have already resolved their differences and have also filed quashing petition bearing CRM-M-639-2022 in this Court on the strength of the said compromise.

Mr. Mohit, Advocate, appears on behalf of complainant and

reiterates the factum of compromise and states that the complainant has no objection to the petition being allowed for bail.

Learned State counsel on the other hand opposes the prayer made by the petitioner and submits that offence under Section 307 IPC is made out as the petitioners hit the motorcycle on which the victims were sitting twice over. It is however, not denied by him that the petitioner is in custody since 30.09.2021 and is not required for any purpose of investigation.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the period of custody as also the fact that parties have resolved their dispute and the fact that no interest of justice would be served by any further incarceration of the petitioner in jail, I deem it fit and appropriate to allow the instant petition.

The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

The instant petition is accordingly disposed of.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

10.03.2022
anil

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned :</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>