

2025:PHHC:083902



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

**CRM-M-35122-2025
Date of Decision:11.07.2025**

Gurneet Singh @ Deenu ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana ...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Inderjeet Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Kirpal Singh Thakur, AAG, Haryana.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (ORAL)

1. Petitioner has approached this Court by way of present petition praying for granting regular bail in case FIR No.44 dated 08.02.2024 under Sections 148/149/308/323/325/506 of IPC, 1860, registered at Police Station Bilaspur, District Yamuna Nagar.

2. Succinctly, facts of the case are that the instant FIR was registered on the statement of the complainant Pravinder Singh. It has been alleged that on 07.02.2024, he went to Balaji Service and Washing Centre, Bilaspur. When he was waiting for his car wash, in the meantime, a Swift car came from the Jagadhri side, from which Gurneet @ Deenu came out, who was holding an iron rod. He along with other 6-7 boys attacked the complainant. Gurneet @ Deenu (petitioner) tried to hit with the rod on his head, however, the same hit on his hand. The other boys also gave him beatings. He was shifted to Civil Hospital, Yamuna Nagar. Request was made to take legal action. On registration of FIR, the investigation commenced. The petitioner was arrested

on 01.03.2024. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Sessions Judge, Yamuna Nagar praying for grant of regular bail. However, after hearing both the sides, the learned Court finding no merit in the same, dismissed the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 29.05.2025 (Annexure P-4). Thereafter, he approached this Court by way of filing CRM-M-29495-2024 (Annexure P-5), which was dismissed as not pressed on 03.07.2024. Hence, the petitioner has approached this Court praying for grant of bail by way of filing the present second petition.

3. It has been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has been roped falsely and frivolously in the present case. He further submits that the petitioner has been alleged to have given rod blow to the petitioner. He submits that as per MLR of the complainant (Annexure P-3) fracture injury has been allegedly attributed to the petitioner. He submits that the petitioner is behind bars since the date of his arrest i.e. 01.03.2024 but there is no progress in the trial. He submits that the petitioner is involved in several other cases, however, in majority of the cases, he is on bail. He has suffered incarceration of 01 year, 04 months and 10 days. He submits that in view of the facts and circumstances of the case, the petitioner deserves to be granted bail.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. He submits that not only the petitioner has been specifically named in the FIR rather he played an active role in causing injuries to the complainant. He submits that the petitioner is a habitual offender, who is facing prosecution in other 24 cases. On instructions from ASI, Vikram, he submits that out of 21 prosecution witnesses, only 03 witnesses have been examined so far. He has placed on record custody certificate of the petitioner.

5. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is

deciphered that the petitioner was arrested in the present case on 01.03.2024. As per MLR, fracture injury has been attributed to the petitioner. The custody certificate would reflect that the petitioner has suffered incarceration of 01 year 04 months & 10 days as on 10.07.2025. It further reflects that petitioner is involved in various cases, however, in majority of the cases, he is on bail.

6. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. The trial of the case will take sufficient long time. Needless to say, that petitioner has fundamental right of speedy trial. Thus, keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

7. 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. However, if the petitioner does not furnish the bail bonds within 07 days from today, then his further custody period after one week will not be counted in this case.

8. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

11.07.2025

Parveen kumar

**(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned :Yes/No

Whether reportable :Yes/No