



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

267

CRM-M-2414-2025

Date of decision: January 22nd, 2025

Abhi alias Sonu alias Abhi Arora

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. AS. Brar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. H.S. Deol, Senior Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

This is a second petition filed by the petitioner seeking the concession of regular bail in FIR No.60 dated 30.05.2024 registered under Sections 323/324/148/149/325/326/201 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station Gidderbaha, District Sri Muktsar Sahib.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been in custody since 08.08.2024 in a case of false implication; the factum of the petitioner having been implicated in the present case on the basis of some misplaced suspicion is evident from the fact that the parties subsequently ironed out their differences vide compromise dated 13.12.2024 (Annexure P-6). It has been contended that even otherwise, investigation in the present case is complete as challan stands presented. Hence, in the aforementioned facts and circumstances, further incarceration of the petitioner would serve no useful purpose.

3. Ms. Chetna, Advocate, has entered appearance on behalf of the complainant and filed her power of attorney, which is taken on record. Learned counsel for the complainant does not dispute the submissions made by the counsel opposite and submits that in view of the difference having been ironed out between the parties, she would not oppose the prayer for extending the concession of bail to the petitioner.
4. Learned State counsel has, however, feigned ignorance about the parties having effected a compromise; the learned State counsel has instead contended that the petitioner has been specifically named and attributed a role in the occurrence in question. He along with other co-accused attacked the complainant party with lethal weapons, as a result of which they sustained a number of injuries. However, learned State counsel, on instructions, has not disputed the custody period of the petitioner nor has it been disputed that the investigation in the present case is complete and challan stands presented.
5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant material on record.
6. In the facts and circumstances as enumerated hereinabove and in view of the parties having ironed out their differences vide compromise dated 13.12.2024 (Annexure P-6), 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 22nd, 2025
Puneet

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes
Whether reportable : No