

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

215

CRM-M-4712-2023

Date of decision: 16.05.2023

RANJODH SINGH**...Petitioner****VERSUS****STATE OF PUNJAB****...Respondent****CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK MANCHANDA**

Present: Mr. Manvinder Singh Sidhu, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Madhur Sharma, AAG, Punjab.

DEEPAK MANCHANDA, J.(ORAL)

Petitioner has filed this petition under Section 439 Cr.P.C. for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.116 dated 29.09.2022 under Sections 307, 324, 120-B and 34 of IPC, registered at Police Station Lakho Ke Behram, District Ferozepur.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and the allegation levelled against the petitioner are totally absurd and preposterous. It is alleged that on 26.09.2022, petitioner gave kirch blows on the complainant when he was standing near his fields. He further contends that as per Medico Legal Report, two injuries on the person of the complainant were declared grievous, however, were not dangerous to the life and were on the non-vital parts of the body of the complainant-injured, whereas other injuries inflicted by the petitioner were simple in nature. The petitioner is in custody since 29.11.2022. He submits that bail applied by the petitioner has wrongly been dismissed by the Sessions Judge, Ferozepur, vide order dated 16.01.2023 (Annexure P-3). He submits

that challan stands presented, charges are yet to be framed and the conclusion of trial will take sufficient time, therefore, the petitioner be enlarged on bail. He further submits that the petitioner is involved in one more case, in which he is already on bail.

On the other hand, learned State counsel assisted by ASI Balbir Singh has opposed the aforesaid prayer on the ground that allegations levelled against the petitioner are serious in nature. However, he has not disputed the fact that challan has been presented but charges are yet to be framed.

Mr. Ranbir Singh Sekhon, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of complainant and filed his *Vakalatnama*, the same is taken on record.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties.

Petitioner is in incarceration since 29.11.2022.

It is not a case made out by the respondent-State that in case concession of bail is granted to the petitioner, he would hamper the course of free and fair trial. Further, since the investigation has already been completed, challan stands presented but charges are yet to be framed and keeping in view the trial would take sufficient time, no useful purpose would be served in keeping the petitioner behind bars.

Resultantly, without meaning any expression of opinion on the merits of the case, it is ordered that the petitioner be released on regular bail subject to his furnishing requisite bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court concerned.

The petition is allowed.

May 16, 2023

nisha-II

(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No