

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M- 50224-2022 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 17.02.2023

Hari Singh

... Petitioner

V/s.

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK MANCHANDA

Present : Mr. Arshdeep Singh Cheema, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Bhupender Singh, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Rohit Mittal, Advocate
for the complainant.

DEEPAK MANCHANDA, J.(Oral)

Petitioner has prayed for grant of regular bail under Section 439 Cr.P.C. in case FIR No. 412 dated 13.07.2022, under Sections 323, 506, 325, 307 and 34 IPC registered at Police Station City Narnaul, District Mahendergarh.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is in custody since 30.08.2022. As per the allegations levelled in the FIR, the petitioner, who is the father-in-law of the complainant-Ritu gave injuries on the head of the complainant (daughter-in-law), pursuant to which present

FIR was got registered against the petitioner herein, his wife Shanti

(mother-in-law) and their son Ranjeet (husband of the complainant). Learned counsel submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case as due to some personal discord between the complainant and her husband Ranjit, the petitioner has been roped in. He further submits that the co-accused namely Shanti and Ranjit have already been granted concession of bail and nothing is to be recovered from the petitioner and the challan stands presented and the conclusion of trial will take sufficient time, therefore, the petitioner be enlarged on bail.

Custody certificate filed by the respondent-State is already available on record. Even though learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent-State, on instructions from the Investigating Officer, opposes the grant of regular bail to the petitioner, while submitting that the offence alleged against the petitioner is serious in nature as some injuries are grievous and life-threatening however, does not dispute the fact that co-accused namely Shanti and Ranjit have been allowed bail and the challan stands presented on 04.10.2022.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties.

Petitioner is in incarceration since 30.08.2022.

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 co-accused have already been allowed bail, the challan stands presented, there are no other antecedents against the petitioner and the trial would take sufficient time, no useful purpose would be served in keeping the petitioner behind bar.

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.

(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)
JUDGE

17.02.2023
seema

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Whether Reportable</i>	<i>Yes /No</i>