

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

237-A

CRM-M-23153-2022 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 23.08.2022

PARVINDER SINGH PANJETA ALIAS PARWINDER SINGH

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present: Mr. Anmol Rattan Sidhu, Senior Advocate with
Ms. Tejaswini, Advocate and
Mr. Jaypreet Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Gagandeep Singh Chhina, AAG Haryana.

Mr. Simranjeet Singh Sidhu, Advocate
for the complainant.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J.(Oral)

Through this petition, the petitioner seeks regular bail in case bearing FIR No.138 dated 23.02.2022, registered at Police Station Ladwa, District Kurukshetra, under Sections 148, 149, 323, 325, 379-B, 506 and 120-B IPC and Section 25 of the Arms Act (challan presented under Sections 148, 149, 323, 325, 506, 307 and 120-B IPC)

As per the prosecution version, 4-5 muffled faced persons attacked the complainant with dandas, bindas and iron rods and have snatched Rs.6,000/- from his jacket.

Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has falsely been involved in the present case; that the FIR was registered against some unknown persons; that the alleged occurrence

took place on 21.02.2022; that the complainant got his supplementary statement recorded on 01.03.2022 stating therein that he had a suspicion that the petitioner was the one, who had attacked him; that the petitioner has been in custody since 05.03.2022; that all the injuries on the person of the complainant were on the non-vital parts and simple in nature, except the injuries on his fingers, which have been declared grievous in nature. He further submits that the parties to the lis are first cousins and that now a compromise has been effected between the parties.

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 was the member of unlawful assembly and had actively participated in the occurrence. He further submits that there were as many as eight injuries on the person of the complainant and that post presentation of challan, the charges are yet to be framed.

Learned counsel for the complainant does not dispute the factum of the compromise and submits that the complainant is not interested in pursuing the present FIR.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

The petitioner has been in custody since 05.03.2022. The compromise has been effected between the parties. There was no injury on the vital part of the complainant. Charges are yet to be framed and prosecution evidence is to commence. 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.

23.08.2022

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)

Aman Jain

JUDGE

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