

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

**CRM-M-13915-2022 (O&M)
Date of decision: 30.05.2022**

Vikas Narwal

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. M.S. Chauhan, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Surender Singh, AAG Haryana.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

Through this petition, the petitioner seeks regular bail in case bearing FIR No.376 dated 29.09.2021, registered under Sections 307, 341 IPC and Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act, at Police Station Baroda, District Sonipat.

Status report by way of affidavit dated 16.05.2022 of the Additional Superintendent of Police, Sonipat, District Sonipat, already filed in the Registry, is taken on record.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case; that the allegation against the petitioner is that he had blocked the way of the complainant by putting his motorcycle in front of him; that the injury attributed to the petitioner is not on the vital part and the same has been declared as simple in nature by the Board of Doctors; that the weapon used in the alleged occurrence, is in the name of the father of the petitioner and a licensed one; that no recovery is to be

effected from the petitioner; that neither there was/is any enmity between the parties nor any provocation between them and that the petitioner has been in custody since 29.09.2021.

Learned State counsel, while vehemently opposing the prayer for bail, submits that the petitioner has given a firm arm injury on the person of the complainant, but the same was on left upper thigh. However, he does not dispute the custody period of the petitioner. The prosecution witnesses are yet to be examined.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

The petitioner has been in custody since 29.09.2021. The injury attributed to the petitioner is not on the vital part of the complainant and the same has also been declared simple in nature by the Board of Doctors. The prosecution witnesses are yet to be examined. The conclusion of the trial would take a long time. Hence, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind the bars.

In view of the above, without commenting anything on the merits, lest it should prejudice the case of either side, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

30.05.2022

Mangal Singh

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

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