

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

CRM-M-15350-2022 (O&M)

Date of decision: 22.07.2022

Sonu @ Sahil @ Sunil

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Lalit Singla, Advocate and
Mr. Shivam Garg, 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.337 dated 06.12.2021, registered at Police Station Narwana City, District Jind, under Sections 147, 149, 323, 307, 506 IPC (Section 307 IPC deleted later on) and Sections 308, 325 and 34 IPC (added later on).

Status report by way of affidavit dated 26.05.2022 of the Assistant Superintendent of Police, Narwana, District Jind, already filed in the Registry, is taken on record.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the allegation against the petitioner is that he along with co-accused had thrown Seema @ Suman, daughter of the complainant, from the first floor while sitting in the chamber of the lawyer with an intention to kill her; that as per the medical report dated 10.01.2022, injuries on the person of Seema @ Suman, daughter of the complainant, were simple in nature; that the petitioner has been in custody since 06.12.2021 and co-accused, namely, Subhash has already been

granted regular bail. He further submits that as far as two other cases are concerned, the petitioner is on bail in those cases.

Learned State counsel, while vehemently opposing the prayer for bail, submits that the petitioner is the main accused and the injury entailing the offence under Section 308 IPC has been attributed to the petitioner. The petitioner is also involved in two other case. However, he does not dispute the custody period of the petitioner. He submits that the prosecution witnesses are yet to be examined.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

The petitioner has been in custody since 06.12.2021. Co-accused, Subhash has already been granted regular bail. In two other cases, the petitioner is on bail. The prosecution witnesses are yet to be examined. Therefore, the conclusion of the trial would take 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.

CRM-21064-2022

In view of the aforesaid order, the present application disposed of, as having been rendered infructuous.

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

22.07.2022

Mangal Singh

Whether reasoned/speaking?

Yes/No

Whether reportable?

Yes/No