



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

CRM-M-5159-2025

Date of decision : 20.02.2025

Parminder @ Parvinder @ Pami

.....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Sahil Choudhary, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Tanuj Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed by the petitioner praying for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.348 dated 25.10.2019, under Sections 323, 341, 506, 34 of IPC, registered at Police Station Asaudha, Jhajjar.
2. As per the facts of the case, the FIR was registered on the statement of complainant-Omkanwar wherein it was alleged that on 23.10.2019 at about 04:30 PM when he was standing near the shop, Narendra @ Dilu and Pramod @ Mona (petitioner) sons of Jai Singh arrived there. They assaulted him in anger by kicking and beating him. During this altercation, Jai Singh also arrived there and he also assaulted the complainant. On raising alarm, all three of them escaped. Request was made to take legal action against the culprits. On registration of the FIR, investigation commenced and petitioner was arrested on 31.10.2019. However, he was granted bail by the Investigating Officer, offences being bailable. However, petitioner thereafter remained absent from the Court and hence, his bail was cancelled on 06.09.2022 and he was declared as proclaimed offender on 18.11.2024. Thereafter, petitioner was arrested on 12.12.2024. Petitioner approached the Court of learned Sessions Judge,



Jhajjar. However, after hearing counsel for the parties, learned Sessions Judge, declined the same vide his order dated 27.12.2024. Hence, being aggrieved, petitioner is before this Court by way of filing the present petition.

3. It has been submitted by counsel for the petitioner that petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. He submits that the offences were bailable, however, the petitioner due to his ill-health remained absent. He submits that the petitioner is behind bars from the date of his arrest and he would abide by the terms and conditions of the bail if granted. He submits that petitioner is not involved in any other case.

4. Learned State counsel however, submits that petitioner was granted bail but due to his conduct he was declared as proclaimed offender and thereafter, he was arrested. It is submitted that out of 05 prosecution witnesses, 01 witness has been examined. He submits that as per the information, petitioner is not involved in any other case.

5. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that petitioner was granted bail by the investigating officer however, he was declared as proclaimed offender as he jumped the bail. Thereafter, he was arrested on 12.12.2024 and is behind bars since then. There is nothing on record to show that petitioner has any criminal antecedents. As submitted by learned State counsel, out of 05 prosecution witnesses, 01 witness already stand examined.

6. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. The trial of the case will take sufficiently long time. Thus, keeping in view the overall facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner



succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

20.02.2025
m.sharma

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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