

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

CRM-M-29059-2022
Date of Decision:-**26.08.2022**

Vishal Chopra @ Rocky ... Petitioner
Versus
State of Punjab and another ... Respondent

-.-

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KARAMJIT SINGH

-.-

Present:- Mr. Ashish Aggarwal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Jaspal Singh Guru, AAG, Punjab.

Ms. Kiranpreet Kaur, Advocate
for the complainant.

-.-

KARAMJIT SINGH, J. (Oral)

The petitioner has approached this Court seeking grant of regular bail in a case having FIR No.15 dated 9.2.2021 registered under Sections 307, 506, 148, 149, IPC and Section 25 of Arms Act at Police Station Mohkampura, District Amritsar City.

The counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case at the instance of the complainant Sukhwinder Singh. The counsel for the petitioner further submits that during investigation, the petitioner was arrested on 12.3.2022 and since then he is languishing behind the bars. The counsel for the petitioner further submits that now the matter has been compromised between the parties and on the basis of said compromise the parties have moved this Court seeking quashing of the FIR in the present case as is evident from Annexures P-3 to P-5.

The counsel for the complainant has not disputed the fact of the compromise which has been effected between the parties and further she is having no objection if the bail is granted to the petitioner.

However, the present petition is resisted by the State counsel, who submitted that as per the allegations recorded in the FIR, the petitioner fired shots, which hit on the leg of the complainant. The State counsel on instructions from ASI Ashwani Kumar has apprised the Court that the challan has already been presented.

As per the custody certificate furnished by the State counsel, the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 5 months. It appears that now matter has been compromised between the parties. Further after completion of investigation challan has been presented by the police before the Court concerned. So no useful purpose is going to be served by keeping the petitioner behind the bars for any longer period.

Keeping in view facts and circumstances mentioned above, no fruitful purpose is going to be served even if the petitioner is kept in judicial custody for indefinite period. Thus without commenting on the merits of the case, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing bail and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/CJM/Duty Magistrate concerned.

(KARAMJIT SINGH)
JUDGE

26.08.2022
Gaurav Sorot

Whether reasoned / speaking? Yes / No

Whether reportable? Yes / No