

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

208

2024:PHHC:007770

CRM-M-53198-2023

Date of decision: January 20th, 2024

Virender

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Aditya Sanghi, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rahul Mohan, Senior Deputy Advocate General,
Haryana.

Mr. Sagar Doon, Advocate
for the complainant.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

Petitioner is seeking the concession of bail under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 in case FIR No.185 dated 21.05.2023 under Sections 147, 148, 149, 307, 323, 324, 506, 326, 452 of the IPC and Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959, registered at Police Station Dabwali Sadar, District Sirsa.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner, *inter alia*, contends that it is a case of version and cross version, wherein admittedly both sides sustained injuries at the hands of each other. It has been further submitted that after the charges were framed on 04.11.2023, the trial had not proceeded any further. It has still further been submitted that in the interregnum, the parties, who admittedly are co-villagers, have ironed out their differences and compromised the matter between them.

3. Mr. Sagar Doon, Advocate, appearing on behalf of the complainant and injured Sandeep has not disputed the submissions

made by the counsel for the petitioner qua the parties having indeed compromised the matter. He submits that he would have no objection in case the petitioner is extended the concession of bail.

4. Learned State counsel, on instructions, has not disputed that a complaint had indeed been lodged by the petitioner against the opposite party, which as per learned State counsel, however, came to be subsequently cancelled. Learned State counsel has also not disputed that after the charges were framed on 04.11.2023, the trial had not proceeded any further and the next date fixed before the trial Court was 20.01.2024.

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

6. In the facts and circumstances as enumerated hereinabove, with no objection from the counsel for the complainant, in view of the parties having amicably settled the dispute, this Court deems it fit to extend the concession of bail to the petitioner.

7. The instant petition is allowed. The petitioner be admitted to bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned. 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.

January 20th, 2024
Puneet

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes

Whether reportable : No