

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-20645-2024
Date of Decision:02.05.2024

SANDEEP ...Petitioner

Vs.

STATE OF HARYANA ...Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE N.S.SHEKHAWAT

Present: Mr. R.K. Hooda, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ram Kumar Singla, DAG, Haryana.

N.S.SHEKHAWAT, J. (Oral)

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in the head note as well as in the prayer clause Section 323 has been wrongly mentioned as 232. It is ordered to be read as Section 323 IPC. Learned counsel for the petitioner is permitted to carry out the necessary corrections in the Court today itself.
2. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure with a prayer to grant regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.255 dated 23.06.2023 under Sections 148, 149, 323, 324 325, 308 and 506 IPC registered at Police Station Meham, District Rohtak.
3. As per the case of prosecution, the petitioner had caused an injury on the head of the complainant namely Sameer with an iron rod and the said injury has been declared to be grievous in nature. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that injured has already been discharged long ago

and the petitioner was arrested in the present case on 22.12.2023 and final report under Section 173 of Cr.P.C. has already been presented against him. He further contends that the conclusion of the trial may take quite a long time and his custody will not serve any meaningful purpose.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the prayer made by the learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that there are serious allegations against the petitioner and the petitioner is not entitled for the concession of regular bail.

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

6. In the present case, the petitioner is in custody for the last more than four months and the challan has already been presented against the present petitioner. Now the case is listed on 09.05.2024 for framing of charges before the trial Court. Consequently there are little chances of early conclusion of the trial in the present case.

7. In view of the above, without commenting any further on the merits, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/CJM concerned.

02.05.2024*M.Sikka***(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE**

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