

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

235

**CRM-M-12155 of 2022
Date of Decision: 28.03.2022**

Jora Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASGURPREET SINGH PURI

Present: Mr. Partap Singh, 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 FIR No.189, dated 09.09.2021 under Sections 307, 323, 341, 506, 34 IPC and Section 25 of Arms Act (Sections 148, 149 IPC and Section 27 of Arms Act added lateron), registered at Police Station Titram, District Kaithal, Haryana.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is in custody from 08.10.2021 which is almost more than four months and the challan has already been presented. He further submitted that the other co-accused has been granted bail by this Court vide order dated 17.02.2022 (Annexure P-4) and so far as the present petitioner is concerned, the matter has since been compromised between the parties and therefore, the petitioner may be considered for the grant of concession of regular bail.

On the other hand, Mr. Ranvir Singh Arya, learned Additional Advocate General, Haryana, has submitted that it is a case where the petitioner is not at parity with the other co-accused in view of the fact that the name of the other co-accused was nominated by way of a supplementary statement and he was not named in the FIR whereas the present petitioner along with the other co-

accused have been specifically named in the FIR and a specific role has been attributed to the petitioner whereby he had caused injury on the right leg of the injured. He further submitted that none of the prosecution witnesses have been examined till date and there is a reasonable apprehension that in case, the petitioner is released on bail then he may threaten or influence the witnesses. He submitted that his reasonable apprehension flows from the fact that after lodging of the present FIR, the petitioner had again caused injuries to the father of the complainant and consequently, FIR No.198 of 2021 under Sections 323, 341, 506 and 34 IPC was lodged against the petitioner. He also submitted that the petitioner is involved in six other cases as well and does not have any clean antecedents and therefore, the petitioner is not entitled for the grant of bail.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

Although the petitioner is in custody from 08.10.2021 but in view of the facts and circumstances stated by learned State counsel, the petitioner would not be entitled for the grant of bail. Apart from the same, the petitioner as per the State counsel, had inflicted injuries upon the father of the complainant after the lodging of the present FIR and therefore, the arguments raised by learned State counsel does carry weight. Consequently, the present petition is hereby dismissed being devoid of any merit.

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.

28.03.2022
rimpal

(JASGURPREET SINGH PURI)
JUDGE

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