

**CRM-M-41574-2025**

1

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

210

CRM-M-41574-2025**Date of decision : 07.08.2025**

Labh Singh

..... Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH


Present: Mr. Lovepreet Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Reepu Dhaman, Asst. A.G. Haryana.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J. (Oral)

1. This petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeking regular bail in a case arising out of FIR No.283 dated 26.05.2023 registered under Sections 323, 325, 307 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code (hereinafter referred to as 'IPC') Police Station Naraingarh, District Ambala. He is in custody since 06.04.2024 and seeking regular bail in the instant petition.

2. A perusal of record show that the FIR, pertaining to instant case, has been lodged in Police Station Naraingarh District Ambala, wherein, it was alleged that on 24.05.2023, at about 08:30 pm when complainant was on his way to home from his workplace, Pawan Kumar and Labh Singh, the petitioner, met him. They were carrying iron rod and iron stick, respectively. According to complainant, he was attacked by the above-named two persons and in the attack Pawan Kumar inflicted a blow with the

**CRM-M-41574-2025**

2

help of iron rod on his head and Labh Singh-petitioner with the help of wooden stick on his left arm, back and legs.

3. With regard to abovementioned bail application, it has been argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that Section 307 of IPC has been invoked in this case in view of the injury inflicted on the head of injured and that the above injury has not been attributed to the petitioner.

4. Learned State Counsel has opposed the claim seeking for bail on the ground that the offence is serious in nature.

5. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner vis-à-vis the learned State Counsel.

6. In my opinion, for the decision of present bail application, following are the relevant factors which need consideration: -

(a) that the petitioner/accused is already in custody for more than one year and four months;

(b) that the injury inviting Section 307 of IPC has not been attributed to the petitioner/accused;

(c) that the injured has already been discharged from the hospital;

(d) that the investigation in the present case is already complete;

(e) that the trial is not likely to be concluded in near future.

7. If the cumulative effect of all the abovementioned factors, involved in the instant case, is taken into consideration, in my opinion, the petitioner is entitled for the benefit of bail.

8. Accordingly, the present petition is hereby allowed and the petitioner is admitted to bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court concerned. In case, the concerned Court is not



CRM-M-41574-2025

available, the learned Sessions Judge would be at liberty to assign the abovesaid case for the abovesaid purpose to any other Court.

9. It is however made clear that any observation made herein above is only for the purpose of deciding the present petition and the same shall have no bearing on the merits of the case.

**(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)
JUDGE**

AUGUST 07, 2025

Gaurav Thakur

Whether speaking / reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No