



In the High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana
At Chandigarh

CRM-M-37241-2024 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 7.8.2024

Munish ... Petitioner
Versus
State of Punjab ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Chandan Singh Rana, Advocate with
Ms. Mandeep Kaur Gill, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Inderjeet Singh Ladher, DAG, Punjab.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Section/s
218	30.8.2023	Sahnewal, District Ludhiana	379-B(2), 34 of Indian Penal Code wherein offenc eunder Sections 411 and 473 of IPC were added later on

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J. (Oral)

- The petitioner seeks grant of regular bail in respect of the aforementioned FIR.
- The FIR was lodged at the instance of Mantosh, wherein it is alleged that on 27.3.2023 at about 11:30 PM, when he alongwith his friends Munish and Durgesh were proceeding towards home on *Activa* scooter, then they were way-laid by six persons. Three of them were carrying iron rods (*long knives*). Immediately upon coming there, they started giving beatings to them and badly injured Munish. It is alleged that they were calling each other as Sandeep, Sonu, Anda, Munish, Dev and Nitin. It is alleged that the said persons snatched the *activa* scooter of the complainant and fled away.



CRM-M-37241-2024 (O&M) (2)

- 3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that a false FIR has been lodged against the petitioner and as a matter of fact he was simply apprehended and as many as 4 FIRs came to be lodged shortly after his arrest. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that although three persons are stated to have been injured, but as per record there is MLR only in respect of Munish Kumar and who was found to have sustained only two injuries, both of which are in the nature of lacerated wounds i.e. one on the forearm and another on elbow. Learned counsel submits that as on date the petitioner has been behind bars since the last about 11 months and 1 day and that since none out of cited 21 PWs has been examined, the petitioner deserves the concession of bail.
- 4. Opposing the petition, learned State counsel submitted that since the petitioner happens to be involved in 4 more cases, no case for grant of bail is made out.
- 5. This Court has considered rival submissions addressed before this Court.
- 6. Without commenting anything as regards the merits of the case but having regard to the long custody of the petitioner and the fact that none out of cited 21 PWs has been examined so far, further detention of the petitioner would not serve any useful purpose as conclusion of trial is likely to consume time.
- 7. The petition, as such, is accepted and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned Trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned.

7.8.2024
Pankaj/G

(Gurvinder Singh Gill)
Judge

Whether speaking /reasoned	Yes / No
Whether Reportable	Yes / No