

209

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

CRM-M-22551-2023

Date of decision: 11.12.2023

Manjit Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KARAMJIT SINGH

Present: Mr. Akbarjit Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Vinay Kumar Gupta, AAG, Punjab.

KARAMJIT SINGH, J. (ORAL)

1. This is second petition for grant of regular bail to petitioner in criminal case having FIR No. 0289 dated 14.09.2021 under Sections 307/34 of IPC and under Sections 25, 27 of Arms Act registered at Police Station City Kapurthala.

2. The brief facts of the case are that complainant Karanbir Singh reported to the police that on 14.09.2021 he along with Prince Grover went to the shop of owner of Samsung Service Centre, Kapurthala namely Manjit Singh, in order to get money from said Manjit Singh. They reached shop of Manjit Singh at 12:30 PM on which Manjit Singh and Sukhdev Singh started quarreling with Prince Grover and Sukhdev Singh hit Prince Grover on his back with die used for pressing mobile phone. In the meantime,

Manjit Singh took out his revolver and fired shot which hit on left bicep of Prince Grover. On this Prince Grover came outside the said shop to save himself but in the meantime, Manjit Singh fired three shots but none of them hit Prince Grover. Manjit Singh fired another two shots which hit Prince Grover in his left flank. Immediately, injured Prince Grover was taken to hospital to provide him medical treatment. During investigation the petitioner was arrested by the police.

3. The counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is falsely implicated in the present case and is in custody for the last more than 2 years and 2 months and is having no criminal history and that injured stands examined. It is further contended that trial is going on at a snail's pace and no purpose is going to be served by keeping the petitioner in custody for any longer period.

4. Status report by way of affidavit of Harpreet Singh Deputy Superintendent of Police, CAW and C, Kapurthala filed on behalf of the State is taken on record. The State counsel while opposing the present petition has submitted that there are serious allegations against the petitioner that he caused fire arm injuries to Prince Grover. However, the State counsel has not disputed the fact that the petitioner is in custody for last more than 2 years and 2 months. It is also not disputed by the State counsel that the petitioner is having no criminal history and that till date only 2 witnesses out of total 14 witnesses are examined on behalf of the petitioner and that injured stands examined during the trial.

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

6. Undoubtedly, fire arm injuries are attributed to the petitioner who is in custody for the last more than 2 years and 2 months and is having no criminal history. Further as per both the counsels, the injured stands examined during the trial. It will take considerable time for the trial to conclude as till date only 2 prosecution witnesses are examined out of total 14 witnesses. Furthermore, the injured has been discharged from the hospital. In the given circumstances, no purpose is going to be served by detaining the petitioner in custody for any longer period.

7. In light of the above, without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and petitioner is directed to be released on regular bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/CJM/Duty Magistrate concerned.

11.12.2023

Yogesh

**(KARAMJIT SINGH)
JUDGE**

**Whether speaking/reasoned:-
Whether reportable:-**

**Yes/No
Yes/No**