



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

**CRM-M-19841-2024**

**Date of Decision: 20.03.2025**

Vinod @ Vinodi

...Petitioner

vs.

State of Haryana

...Respondent

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

Present :    Mr. Amit Choudhary, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajiv Sidhu, DAG, Haryana.

\*\*\*

**N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)**

1.            The petitioner has filed the instant petition under Section 439 of the Cr.P.C. with a prayer to grant regular bail to him in case FIR No.284 dated 24.05.2022 registered under Sections 302, 323, 324, 341, 506, 34 of IPC, at Police Station City Fatehabad, District Fatehabad.

2.            Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that as per the case set up by the prosecution, the petitioner and Dhanat Devi had caught hold of Yogesh Goswami and he was caused injuries by Gulshan @ Kannu. He further contends that Gulshan @ Kannu, the main accused had given two blows with knife to Yogesh Goswami. Learned counsel further contends that the petitioner was arrested in the present case on 24.05.2022 and is in custody for the last more than 2 years and 9 months. Learned counsel further submits that even though, he was involved in 14 other FIRs, but from the perusal of the details of such cases, it is apparent that the petitioner was involved in petty offences and all the trials have already concluded. By referring to the order dated 12.04.2023 (Annexure P-2) passed by this Court, learned counsel further



submits that similarly placed co-accused Dhanat Devi has already been granted the concession of bail by this Court. Similarly placed another co-accused, namely Arun alias Kaku alias Arun Sarsar has also been admitted to bail by this Court, vide order dated 31.01.2024 (Annexure P/2-A). Still further, the prosecution has only examined 12 witnesses, out of total 21 witnesses so far and the trial Court may take considerable time in concluding the trial.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that serious allegations have been levelled against the present petitioner and he does not deserve the concession of bail by this Court.

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

5. The petitioner was arrested in the present case on 24.05.2022 and all the material witnesses have been examined by the prosecution. Still further, it is not in dispute that similarly placed co-accused namely, Dhanat Devi has already been admitted to bail by this Court, vide order dated 12.04.2023 (Annexure P-2).

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

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)  
JUDGE

20.03.2025

hemlata

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