

234 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-14985-2024
Decided on:-03.04.2024

Rohit @ LallaPetitioner..

vs.

U.T. ChandigarhRespondent.

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARKESH MANUJA

Present: Ms. Meghna Nehra, Advocate,
Mr. Rahil Mahajan, Advocate and
Mr. Arjun Dosanj, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Manish Bansal, P.P. U.T., Chandigarh along with
Ms. Diksha Sharma, Advocate and
Mr. Navjit Singh, Advocate,
for respondent-State.

HARKESH MANUJA J. (Oral)

1. By way of present petition filed under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, prayer has been made for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, pending trial in case FIR No.134 dated 17.11.2023, registered under Sections 324, 307, 34 IPC and Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959 at Police Station Maulijagran, Chandigarh.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been implicated against the allegations of having caught hold the injured-victim, resulting into inflicting of injuries to him by the other accomplices.
3. The prayer made herein has been opposed at the instance of learned State counsel while referring to the active participation of the

petitioner in the incident in question and thus, prays for dismissal of the present petition.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and gone through the paper book. I find substance in the submissions made on behalf of the petitioner.

5. In the present case, investigation already stands concluded with the filing of challan and the petitioner is behind the bars for the last almost 3½ months. Moreover, both the parties are residents of the same vicinity and with the intervention of the respectables, a compromise has been arrived at between the parties and a copy of the compromise has been annexed with the petition as Annexure P-4, which has not been even controverted by the learned State counsel.

6. In view of the facts and circumstances narrated above, besides the fact that no injury has been attributed to the present petitioner, this Court does not find any reason to extend the incarceration of the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing adequate bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned Trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

8. It is made clear that this order may not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

03.04.2024
sonika

(HARKESH MANUJA)
JUDGE

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