

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

233

CRM-M-15684-2022 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 20.07.2022

SATPAL SINGH

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present: Mr. RK Doon, 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.431 dated 08.08.2017, registered under Sections 148, 149, 302 and 34 IPC, at Police Station Sampla, District Rohtak.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was arrested on 08.08.2017 and since then he has been in custody; that scissor blow on the left arm flank of the injured has been attributed to the petitioner; that an application under Section 319 Cr.P.C. for summoning additional accused was moved by the complainant and the same was dismissed by the learned trial Court and that against the said order, the complainant has filed a criminal revision petition before this Court, which is pending and passing of the final order has been stayed.

Per contra, while opposing the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, learned State counsel does not dispute the custody period of the petitioner. He, however, submits that the petitioner had

actively participated in the occurrence and inflicted repeated scissor blow on various parts of the body of deceased, namely, Manjit and that scissor used in the crime had already been recovered from the petitioner. He further submits that there are total 23 prosecution witnesses, out of which 14 have already been examined.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

Though multiple injuries have been attributed to the petitioner, yet the fact remains that the petitioner has been in custody since 08.08.2017. Some of the prosecution witnesses are yet to be examined. Further, passing of the final order has been stayed by this Court vide order dated 25.11.2019. In such circumstances, the trial of the case would take a long time to conclude. Therefore, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind the bars.

In view of the above and without commenting anything on the merits of the case, lest it should prejudice the case of either side, 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 learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

20.07.2022

Aman Jain

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)

JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : *Yes/No*
Whether reportable : *Yes/No*