



218

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

CRM-M-281-2024

Date of Decision: 04.02.2025

TARUN KUMAR @ TARUN GUPTA

....Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

....Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Ramneek Vasudeva, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Amandeep Singh, DAG, Punjab

\*\*\*\*

**SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)**

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C., for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in DDR No.23 dated 17.09.2023 under Sections 308, 323, 506, 148, 149, 427, 341 of IPC (Section 201 of IPC added vide order dated 28.02.2024) recorded as cross-case in FIR No.85 dated 17.09.2023 under Sections 307, 323, 506 read with Section 34 of IPC and Section 25 of Arms Act, 1959, registered at Police Station Sadar Rupnagar, District Rupnagar (Punjab).

2. In the present regular bail petition on 22.02.2024, following order was passed:-

*'Contends that petitioner is in custody since 17.09.2023. After investigation, report under Section 173 Cr.P.C. was submitted on 14.12.2023 and it is a cross version case in FIR No. 85 dated 17.09.2023 under Section 307, 323, 506 read with Section 34 of Indian Penal Code, 1860 along*



*with other ancillary offences. Also contends that there is no other criminal case pending against the petitioner.*

*Learned State counsel seeks time to verify the above factual position.*

*Posted for 02.05.2024.*

*In the meanwhile, petitioner be released on interim bail in the present case till the next date of hearing on furnishing adequate bail and surety bonds subject to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/CJM/Duty Magistrate concerned'*

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been implicated as an accused in cross-version case, which has been registered through DD No.23 dated 17.09.2023. The petitioner has been attributed an injury with iron rod on the head of Rajesh Kumar, which is not declared grievous one.

3.1 While referring to order dated 22.02.2024, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he being released on interim bail, has been appearing regularly before the learned trial Court and has thus, never misused the concession. He further submits that proceedings of the trial are being conducted at a low pace and there is no likelihood of the culmination of the trial in early days. Thus, prays for release on regular bail or to make the order of interim bail dated 22.02.2024 as absolute. Learned counsel also submits that all other accused are already on bail.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel, very fairly endorses the factual contention addressed by learned counsel for the petitioner and also that all other accused are on bail. He has no material to highlight that after releasing on interim bail, petitioner has ever misused the concession of interim bail.

**CRM-M-281-2024**

3

5. Be that as it may. Present petition is **allowed**. Order dated 22.02.2024 is hereby made absolute, however, petitioner is directed to furnish bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

6. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

7. The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case and the Trial Court is expected to decide the case on the basis of complete evidence available on record.

8. Petition stands disposed of.

**February 04, 2025**  
Sangeeta

**(SANJAY VASHISTH)**  
**JUDGE**

Whether reasoned/speaking:  
Whether reportable:

Yes/No  
Yes/No