

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

CRM-M-10023-2024
Decided on : 29.02.2024

Sahil Gill and another

..... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present : Mr. Rahul Bhargava, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Navdeep Singh, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Kashav Chadha, Advocate
for the complainant.

Manjari Nehru Kaul, J.(Oral)

1. Instant petition has been filed by the petitioner seeking concession of regular bail in case FIR No.230 dated 05.11.2023 under Sections 379-B, 34 IPC (Section 379-B (2) IPC added later on vide G.D. No.40) registered at Police Station Ranjit Avenue District Police Commissionerate Amritsar.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that the petitioner has been in custody since 06.11.2023 in a case where he had been implicated on the basis of some misguided suspicion. Learned counsel submits that after the registration of FIR in question, challan was presented before the trial Court, however,

subsequently, the misunderstanding between the complainant and the petitioner had been removed, as a result of which, the petition under Section 482 Cr.PC would be filed shortly for quashing of the FIR in question.

3. Per contra, learned State counsel has, however, feigned ignorance about the statement made by learned counsel for the petitioner. He, on instructions, has not disputed that the investigation in the case in hand is complete as challan stands presented.

4. Learned counsel appearing for the complainant has not disputed the submission made by learned counsel for the petitioner qua a compromise having been effected between the parties.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material placed on record.

6. The petitioner has been in custody since 06.11.2023. The investigation in the case in hand is complete as challan stands presented. The matter has been compromised between the complainant and the petitioner.

7. In the facts and circumstances as enumerated hereinabove, this Court deems it fit to extend the concession of regular bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner be admitted to bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

8. However, it is made clear that anything observed

hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

29.02.2024
sonia

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

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