

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

221

CRM-M-11472-2022
Decided on : 23.03.2022

Charanjit Singh @ Channu

. . . Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

. . . Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

PRESENT: Mr. Sandeep Arora, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sarabjit S. Cheema, AAG, Punjab.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (Oral)

The present petition has been filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C. for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 290 dated 27.12.2021 under Sections 323, 326, 341, 148 and 149 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 registered at Police Station Rama Mandi, District Jalandhar.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that even as per the prosecution case, only one injury has been attributed to the petitioner which is simple in nature and the petitioner was not named in the FIR and he is not involved in any other case. It is further submitted that the petitioner has been in custody since 03.01.2022 and challan in the present case has already been filed and there are as many as 12

witnesses out of whom, none has been examined as yet and thus, the trial is likely to take time, moreso, in view of the present COVID-19 pandemic situation.

Learned State counsel, on the other hand, has opposed the present application for regular bail and, on instructions from ASI Daljinder Lal, has submitted that the injured has suffered 5 injuries out of which 4 have been declared as grievous in nature and one injury has been declared as simple in nature. It is further submitted that the sole injury which has been attributed to the petitioner is simple in nature.

This Court has heard learned counsel for the parties and has perused the paperbook.

It is not in dispute that the petitioner was not named in the FIR. The sole injury which has been attributed to the petitioner is simple in nature. The petitioner is not involved in any other case. The petitioner has been in custody since 03.01.2022 and the challan in the present case has already been presented and there are as many as 12 witnesses, out of whom none have been examined, thus, the trial is likely to take time, moreso, in view of the present COVID-19 pandemic situation.

Keeping in view the abovesaid facts and circumstances, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate and subject to him not being required in any other case.

However, nothing stated above shall be construed as a final expression of opinion on the merits of the case and the trial would proceed independently of the observations made in the present case which are only for the purpose of adjudicating the present bail application.

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

March 23rd, 2022
Mehak

Whether reasoned/speaking?	Yes/No
Whether reportable?	Yes/No