

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

CRM-M-34943-2022
Date of Decision:-**11.11.2022**

JAGGAN

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

... Respondent

-.-

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KARAMJIT SINGH

-.-

Present:- Mr. Vipul Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Harpreet Kaur, AAG, Haryana.

-.-

KARAMJIT SINGH, J. (Oral)

Prayer is for grant of regular bail in case having FIR No.31 dated 15.01.2022 registered under Sections 148, 149, 323, 324, 326, 506 IPC and Section 3(2) v(a) of SC/ST Act at Police Station Chandhut District Palwal.

Mr. Bhisham Kumar, Advocate puts in appearance on behalf of the complainant and has filed power of attorney, the same is taken on record.

The counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and is lodged behind the bars for last more than 8 months. The counsel for the petitioner further submits that only simple injury has been attributed to the petitioner and it will take time for the trial to conclude, so prayer is made for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

The instant petition is opposed by the State counsel as well as by the counsel for the complainant, both of whom have submitted that at the

time of occurrence petitioner being member of the unlawful assembly caused injuries to the complainant party. However, the State counsel has not disputed the fact that only simple injuries are attributed to the present petitioner, who was armed with the wooden stick at the time of the occurrence. Even the custody period of the petitioner has not been disputed by the State counsel.

I have considered the submissions made by counsel for the parties.

In the present case only simple injuries are attributed to the petitioner and he was stated to be armed with wooden stick. The exact complicity of the petitioner will be adjudicated by the trial Court at the appropriate stage of the trial. Admittedly the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 8 months and it will take for the trial to conclude. So no purpose is going to be served by prolonging judicial custody of the petitioner.

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

11.11.2022
Gaurav Sorot

Whether reasoned / speaking? Yes / No

Whether reportable? Yes / No