

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH**CRM-M-28525-2022 (O & M)****Date of decision: 12.07.2022**

Vinod Petitioner

V/s

State of Haryana ...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI

Present: Mr. Diwan S. Adlakha, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Parveen Kr. Aggarwal, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Raman Chawla, Advocate, for the complainant.

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J. (Oral)

The prayer in the present petition under Section 439 Cr.P.C. is for the grant of the regular bail to the petitioner in a case FIR No.507 dated 18.11.2021 under Sections 148, 149, 341, 323, 324, 325, 302 and 506 IPC and Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959 registered with Police Station Matlauda, District Panipat.

2. The brief facts of the case are that the statement of Bir Singh son of Pawan was recorded to the effect that on 17.11.2021 at about 8.30/9.00 p.m. he and his cousin Sunil son of Shiv Kumar were working in the fields near the canal next to the drain. Sunil proceeded on his motorcycle from the fields to purchase some articles from the shop at some distance. Meanwhile, Deepak son of Badlu and Mohit son of Ajab Singh came on a tractor loaded with dirty water and started dumping the dirty water in the drain. When Sunil asked as to why they are dumping dirty water near their

fields, they struck Sunil with tractor which was being driven by Mohit. A

fight ensued and hearing the noise of the fight, Sudarshan son of Jai Kishan, Sheeshpal son of Mahendra and Sachin son of Pawan, who were present in the nearby fields, reached at the spot and intervened. In the meantime, Deepak called Vikas son of Ramesh, Sandeep son of Ramesh, Ajay son of Omprakash, Rohit son of Badlu (since granted bail) and Vinod son of Narendra (the present petitioner) by making a phone call. All these persons reached the spot with knives, *gandasis* and *bindas*. Vikas gave 4/5 knife injuries to Sunil son of Shiv Kumar (deceased) and 4-5 knife blows to him (complainant). On the intervention of Sachin, Sudarshan, Sheeshpal and others, they too were caused injuries with knives, *gandasi* and *bindas*.

Due to the injury suffered, Sunil fell at the spot and the accused fled away from there. Sunil died on the way of the Hospital.

The learned counsel for the petitioner contends that there is a delay of 08 hours in lodging the FIR and it has been registered with due deliberation. So far as the present petitioner is concerned, he has not been attributed any specific injury on the deceased, who has received injuries inflicted by sharp-edged weapons. During the course of the investigation, the supplementary statement of the complainant-Bir Singh was recorded and a perusal of the same would reveal that, in fact, the petitioner had come to the spot later when the deceased was about to be taken to the hospital in a vehicle. He also contends that as per the statements under Section 161 Cr.P.C. of Sachin, Vishal, Jitender, Sudarshan and Sheeshpal (Annexure P-3 to P-7), no specific injury has been attributed to the petitioner either on the person of the deceased or on the person of any of the injured. It is lastly contended that only a *danda* has been recovered from the petitioner. He, thus, contends that since the petitioner is in custody since 09.12.2021 and

examined, he deserves the concession of regular bail, moreso when his co-accused Rohit @ Rohit Kumar has been granted the concession of regular bail vide order dated 13.06.2022 (Annexure P-9).

The learned State counsel who is duly supported by the learned counsel for the complainant, on the other hand, contended that the petitioner and all the other accused had committed the offences in question and the petitioner was liable with the aid of Section 149 IPC. There was a video recording of the incident which shows that the incident did take place in the manner as suggested in the FIR. As many as 04 other persons from the complainant-party, namely, Sachin, Sudarshan, Bir Singh and Sheeshpal have received injuries, and therefore, the petitioner does not deserve the concession of regular bail.

I have heard the learned counsel for both the parties at length.

As per the case of the prosecution, no specific injury has been attributed to the petitioner either on the person of the deceased or on the person of any of the injured. A recovery of a *danda* has been shown from him though the injuries on the person of the deceased appear to have been caused by sharp-edged weapons. Therefore, it would be a matter of adjudication during trial as to whether or not the petitioner could be convicted substantially under Section 302 IPC or with the aid of Section 149 IPC.

The learned State counsel on instructions from SI Jaiveer Singh submits that video recording of the incident, at the instance of the complainant party, does not show the petitioner playing any role in the occurrence. Further, as many as 29 prosecution witnesses have been cited in the list of witnesses and none of them have been examined so far. He

admits that the co-accused Rohit @ Rohit Kumar has been granted the concession of bail vide order (Annexure P-9).

In view of the aforementioned facts and also the fact that the petitioner is in custody since 09.12.2021 and the investigation already stands completed, the further incarceration of the petitioner is not required. Thus, without commenting upon the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner, namely, Vinod, is ordered to be released on bail to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

If any attempt whatsoever is made by the petitioner and/or his family members to contact/threaten/intimidate any of the witnesses of the present occurrence, the State/complainant shall be at liberty to move an application for cancellation of bail granted vide this order.

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE

July 12, 2022
sukhpreet

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No