

220

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-60619-2023 (O&M)
Date of decision : 21.02.2024

Jatinder Singh @ Faujji

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARKESH MANUJA

Present : Mr. Mandeep Kaushik, Advocate for
Mr. Rajesh Kapila, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Davinder Bir Singh, Senior DAG, Punjab.

HARKESH MANUJA.J. (ORAL)

1. By way of present petition filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C., prayer has been made for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No. 136 dated 07.09.2023 registered under Sections 307, 324, and 341 of IPC at Police Station Dakha, District Ludhiana Rural (Annexure P-1), wherein the petitioner has inflicted four injuries upon the persons of the complainant.
2. The prayer made on behalf of the petitioner has been opposed by learned State counsel while submitting that the custody period is only around 06 months and thus, the petitioner does not deserve the concession of bail.
3. 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.

4. The petitioner has already undergone incarceration of about 06 months. Learned State counsel has not been able to show any medical opinion about the injuries inflicted upon the person of the complainant of being dangerous to life.

5. Considering the fact that the investigation in the present case, already stands concluded with the filing of challan and the fact that the petitioner is already behind the bars around 06 months and the conclusion of trial is likely to take some time and besides their being no apprehension expressed by the prosecution of any kind of influence being exerted upon the prosecution witnesses, I do not find any reason to extend the incarceration of the petitioner any further.

6. Without commenting anything on the merits of the case, lest it may prejudice the trial, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing adequate bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

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

8. All the pending miscellaneous applications, if any, shall stand disposed of in view of the above said order.

(HARKESH MANUJA)
JUDGE

21.02.2024

monika

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