

**CRM-M-18239 of 2025****1**

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

292**CRM-M-18239 of 2025****DATE OF DECISION :- 21.05.2025****Sanjay Kumar @ Gattu****...Petitioner**

Versus

State of Punjab and others**...Respondents****CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL**

Present:- Mr. Gurvinder Singh Aulakh, Advocate
with Mr. Gagandeep Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Shiva Khurmi, AAG, Punjab.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of bail under Section 439 of the Cr.P.C./483 BNSS in case FIR No.0060 dated 30.05.2024 under Sections 323/324/148 & 149 of the IPC (Sections 325 & 326 of IPC added later on vide DDR No. 39, dated 28.06.2024 & Section 201 of IPC also added later on vide DDR No. 22 dated 20.07.2024) registered at Police Station Gidderbaha, District Sri Muktsar Sahib.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that after the petitioner was arrested in the present case on 28.06.2024 not only the charge sheet has been presented against him but even charges framed. However, none of the witnesses cited by the prosecution have been examined so far. It has been further submitted that subsequent to the registration of the FIR in question, the parties have ironed out their differences and compromised the



matter. Further more, it has been submitted that even otherwise the petitioner has not been attributed any injury on any vital part of the body of the complainant.

3. Ms. Chetna Thakur, Advocate, has put in appearance on behalf of respondents No. 2 to 4 and filed his *vakalatnama*, which is taken on record. She has not disputed the averments made by the counsel opposite and also does not oppose the prayer made for extending the concession of bail to the petitioner.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Prabhjot Singh, has not disputed the custody period of the petitioner, however, he submits that 03 out of 21 prosecution witnesses cited have been examined so far. Learned State counsel has further feigned ignorance about the compromise purportedly effected between the parties. He, however, has reiterated the allegations levelled in the FIR which is annexed as Annexure P-1.

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

6. The petitioner has been in custody since 28.06.2024. The petitioner, as per the case of the prosecution itself has been attributed only a single injury on the left knee of the complainant. No other injury has been attributed to the petitioner. Be that as it may, since the trial is unlikely to conclude in the near future and without commenting upon the compromise said to have been effected between the parties, this Court deems it fit to extend the concession of bail to the petitioner as no further incarceration of the petitioner is required.



CRM-M-18239 of 2025 **3**

7. Accordingly, the instant petition is allowed and the petitioner be admitted to bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds 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.

8. Needless to add, in case the petitioner misuses the concession of bail granted to him, the State would be at liberty to seek cancellation of the same.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

21.05.2025
P.Singh

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