

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

**CRM-M-13250-2022**

**Date of Decision: 04.04.2022**

Naseeb

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI**

Present: Mr. Divyam Singh, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Parveen Kumar Aggarwal, DAG, Haryana.

\*\*\*\*

**JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J.(Oral)**

The petitioner seeks grant of regular bail under Section 439 Cr.P.C in case bearing FIR No.242 dated 14.05.2021 registered under Sections 323, 341, 307, 506, 34 IPC, 1860 and Section 25 (Act No.54) of Arms Act 1959 at Police Station Gohana City, District Sonapat (Annexure P-1).

The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the allegation against the petitioner are that, he along with his co-accused assaulted the complainant and that co-accused, namely, Ashok @ Sonu (real brother of the petitioner) had fired at Sahil. He further states that it is a case of no firearm injury and even otherwise the alleged fire shot has been attributed to co-accused/Ashok @ Sonu and not to the petitioner. He further states that the co-accused/Ashok @ Sonu had committed suicide and the alleged weapon used in the commission of the offence, has already been recovered from him. He further states that the petitioner has been in custody since 19.05.2021 and 16 prosecution witnesses are yet to be examined. In FIR No.0158 dated 10.05.2021

registered under Sections 379-B and 458 Cr.P.C, the petitioner was arrested only after he was taken into custody in the present FIR No.242 dated 14.05.2021 registered under Sections 323, 341, 307, 506, 34 IPC, 1860 and Section 25 (Act No.54) of Arms Act 1959 at Police Station Gohana City, District Sonapat (P-1)

The custody period and the stage of proceedings has been admitted by the learned State counsel, who also admits that no injury has been attributed to the petitioner with firearm.

I have heard the rival contentions of both the parties.

Admittedly, the petitioner has not caused any firearm injury to the injured and has been in custody since 19.05.2021 and the challan stands presented. The further incarceration of the petitioner is not required.

In view of above, without adverting to the merits of the case, I deem it appropriate to enlarge the petitioner on regular bail. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing adequate bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/concerned Duty Magistrate.

Nothing expressed hereinabove would be construed to be an expression of any opinion on merits of the case.

**(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)**  
**JUDGE**

**04.04.2022**

*JITESH*

Whether speaking/reasoned      Yes/No

Whether reportable                Yes/No