



240

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-60599-2024

Date of Decision:09.12.2024

SANJEEV KUMAR ALIAS ANTU

...PETITIONER

VS.

STATE OF HARYANA

...RESPONDENT

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat

Present : Ms. Pallavi Babbar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajinder Kumar Banku, DAG, Haryana.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 483 of Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, with a prayer to grant regular bail to him in case FIR No.0382 dated 05.08.2024, registered under Section 109(1), 115, 118(1), 190, 191(3), 351(2) of BNS, Police Station Kurukshetra University, District Kurukshetra (Annexure P-1).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely involved in the present case. As per the version of the prosecution, the petitioner was allegedly armed with a stick and had attacked Parveen Kumar alias Kali injured. She further submits that the injury on head suffered by Parveen Kumar alias Kali has been declared to be dangerous to life, which has been attributed to Khushi Ram co-accused, who was allegedly armed with a *gandasi*. The petitioner was arrested in the present case on 06.08.2024 and is in custody last more than 4 months. She further submits that the injured in the



present case has already been discharged and after completion of investigation, challan has been presented against the present petitioner.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that the petitioner is a habitual offender and is involved in two more criminal cases. However, learned State counsel does not dispute the fact that Shiv Kumar @ Shiva Pandit have been granted the concession of regular bail, whereas, Rahul and Salinder Kumar have been granted the anticipatory bail by this Court.

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

5. In the present case, the petitioner was arrested on 06.08.2024 and after completion of investigation, challan has been presented against him. The prosecution has placed reliance on 18 witnesses, but no witness has been examined so far. Thus, there are no chances of early conclusion of the trial and the petitioner deserves to be enlarged on regular bail.

6. Without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on bail pending trial on his furnishing bail bonds and surety to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/ Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate.

09.12.2024
vipin

(N.S. SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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