

CRM-M-50157-2022

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-50157-2022

Date of decision: 27.02.2023

Satnam Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. A.D.S.Sukhija, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Ishma Randhawa, Additional AG Punjab.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

Through this third petition (the first one having been dismissed on 22.04.2021 and the second one having been dismissed as withdrawn on 07.02.2022), the petitioner seeks regular bail in case FIR No.76 dated 01.04.2020, registered at Police Station City Rajpura, District Patiala, under Sections 307, 324, 506 and 326 IPC.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been in custody since 21.05.2020 i.e. for the last more than 02 years and 09 months, and that out of 21 prosecution witnesses, 03 witnesses, including the complainant and eye-witness, who are none else but the wife and daughter of the petitioner, have already been examined.

On the other hand, learned State counsel, while opposing the grant of bail to the petitioner, submits that the petitioner had given seven blows with knife to the complainant and out of the said blows, two were in

CRM-M-50157-2022

the abdomen of the complainant, and that the complainant had remained hospitalized for 16 days. Learned State counsel further submits that the complainant-wife and witness-daughter of the petitioner have supported the prosecution version in their testimonies.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

The petitioner has been in custody since 21.05.2020. The testimonies of material witnesses i.e. the complainant and the eye-witness have already been recorded. Trial of the case would take time to conclude. Therefore, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind the bars.

In view of the above, without commenting anything on the merits, lest it should prejudice the case of either side, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate, with a rider that during pendency of trial, he would not enter the house where the complainant and her daughter are residing, and also would not dislodge them from the shop being run in his absence.

27.02.2023

parveen kumar

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No