

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

210

CRM-M-47683-2021

Date of Decision: 29.04.2022

Sachin ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana ...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present: Mr. Vikas Gulia, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajiv Sidhu, DAG, Haryana,
assisted by SI Umesh.

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has approached this Court seeking grant of regular bail in respect of a case registered against him vide FIR No.243 dated 29.05.2021 at Police Station Sonipat Sadar, District Sonipat, under Sections 307/323/341/506 IPC (while Section 34 stands deleted, Section 25 of the Arms Act stands added later on).
2. The allegations in nutshell, as per the FIR lodged at the instance of Sonu, are that the petitioner had given two knife blows to injured Naveen. While one of the stab wound is on chest, the other is stated to be inflicted on abdomen, which according to the opinion of the Doctor was dangerous to life.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the FIR came to be lodged under some misunderstanding and that now when the complainant-Sonu and the injured-Naveen were examined during

the course of trial, they have not supported the case of the prosecution at all and have been declared hostile. It has further been submitted that the petitioner is a young boy aged about 26 years and is not involved in any other case and has been in custody since the last about 10 months.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has not disputed the fact that the complainant and the injured have since resiled, but has submitted that having regard to the serious nature of offence, it could be a case that the petitioner may have been able to intimidate the witnesses. Learned State counsel has, however, informed that the petitioner as on date has been behind bars since the last about 10 months and that he is not involved in any other case.
5. I have considered rival submissions addressed before this Court.
6. Having regard to the fact that the petitioner has been behind bars for a substantial period of about 10 months as well as that the complainant and the injured have resiled and the petitioner is not even stated to be involved in any other case, further detention of the petitioner will not serve any useful purpose as the conclusion of trial will take some time. The petition, as such, is accepted and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned.

29.04.2022

Vimal

(GURVINDER SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

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