

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH.**

CRM-M-60529-2023

Date of Decision:-07.12.2023

Rohit Kumar @ Rohit @ Bugni.

.....Petitioner.

Vs.

State of Punjab.

.....Respondent.

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI

Present:- Mr. Naveen Bawa, Advocate for the Petitioner.

Mr. Harkanwar Jeet Singh, AAG Punjab.

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J.(ORAL)

The Prayer in this petition under Section 439 Cr.PC is for the grant of regular bail in case FIR No.0068 dated 25.03.2022 under Sections 307, 427, 452, 506, 148, 149 IPC registered at Police Station Haibowal, District Ludhiana.

2. The present FIR came to be registered at the instance of Manjit Kumar son of Nathu Ram who stated that he was a driver by profession. The work of sewerage was going on in his locality. On 23.03.2022, when the construction of a manhole was taking place, Amit and Aman who resided opposite his house did not want the construction of the said manhole to take place. Because of this fact, arguments ensued between him and the brothers. On 24.03.2022, while his brother Baljit and Lalit and nephew Vasu and sister-in-law Asha Rani were present at their house, Amit and Aman sons of Shankar Lal entered the house along with Mani (since granted bail vide order dated 20.02.2023 in CRM-M-7677-2023) and his two sons Rahul Sabharwal (granted bail vide order dated 31.01.2023) and Lalli (since granted bail vide order dated 03.08.2023 in CRM-M-18011-2023) and wife Nisha alias Bhola (since granted bail vide order dated 10.10.2022 in CRM-

M-37037-2022). They were accompanied by Raja brother of Bhola and Rohit alias Bugni (petitioner) nephew of Bhola and 10/12 other persons whose names he did not know. All of them were armed with baseball bats, Kirpans, Dattars, Toke and rods. The accused mercilessly beat his brothers Lalit and Baljit, nephew Vasu and sister-in-law Asha Rani. Mani gave a blow of a Kirpan on the head of his brother Baljit. Injuries were also caused to his other brother, nephew Vasu and sister-in-law Asha Rani with Kirpans, Toke and rods which landed on their head, legs, arms and other parts of the body. Because of the same, the injured were drenched in blood. On raising a noise, all the accused fled from the spot.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner contends that though the injured Baljit has received grievous injuries attributed to the co-accused Mani, no injury under Section 307 IPC has been found on the person of any of the injured. Three co-accused had been granted the concession of bail by this Court vide orders dated Annexure P-3 to P-6 respectively. As the petitioner was in custody since 19.09.2023, none of the 16 prosecution witnesses had been examined and the petitioner was a first time offender, he was entitled to the concession of bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned State counsel contends that the accused including the petitioner brutally beaten up the complainant and his family members. As many as 04 persons were caused injuries. The manner of the assault did not entitle the petitioner to the grant of bail. He, however, does not deny the period of custody undergone by the petitioner as also the stage of Trial and the fact that some of the co-accused of the petitioner had been granted the concession of bail.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

6. The veracity of the allegations against the petitioner shall be established during the course of Trial. The petitioner has been in custody since 19.09.2023. None of the 16 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far and so the Trial of the present case is not likely to be concluded anytime soon. Therefore, the further incarceration of the petitioner is not required, more so when some of his co-accused have already been granted the concession of bail.

7. Thus without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner-**Rohit Kumar @ Rohit @ Bugni** son of Sh. Raj Kumar is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing

bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned CJM/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

8. If the petitioner or his family members/associates make any attempt to contact/threaten/intimidate the witnesses in the present case, the State would be at liberty to move an application for cancellation of bail granted vide this order.

9. In addition, the petitioner (or anyone on his behalf) shall prepare an FDR in the sum of Rs.1,00,000/- and deposit the same with the Trial Court. The same would be liable to be forfeited as per law in case of the absence of the petitioner from trial without sufficient cause.

10. The petition stands disposed of.

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE

December 07, 2023

Vinay

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No