

Baldev Singh Vs State of Punjab

Court: High Court Of Punjab And Haryana At Chandigarh

Date of Decision: April 25, 2007

Acts Referred: Penal Code, 1860 (IPC) â€” Section 148, 149, 302, 323, 364

Citation: (2007) 3 RCR(Criminal) 460

Hon'ble Judges: Satish Kumar Mittal, J

Bench: Single Bench

Advocate: Manoj Kumar, for the Appellant; Lekh Raj Sharma, Addl. A.G., Punjab, for the Respondent

Judgement

Satish Kumar Mittal, J.

This is second petition for regular bail filed by Petitioner Baldev Singh in case FIR No. 65 dated 4.5.2001 under

Sections 302/364/323/148/149 IPC, registered at Police Station, Morinda, District Ropar. His earlier petition was dismissed by this Court on

August 30, 2004.

2. I have heard counsel for the parties.

3. The Petitioner is stated to be in custody since 8.5.2001. On 30.8.2004, when the earlier petition was dismissed by this Court, trial court was

directed to expedite the trial. Counsel for the Petitioner states that the trial has not concluded so far and out of twenty four prosecution witnesses,

only seven witnesses have been examined.

4. Counsel for the Petitioner contends that as per the prosecution version, the dispute took place on account of parking of a vehicle. As per the

complainant, 3 salangha blows were given by the Petitioner on the right flank of Ranjit Singh deceased and his co-accused Talvir Singh is alleged

to have given a gandasi blow on the right flank of the deceased. Counsel contends that as per the post-mortem report, only two injuries were

found on the right flank of the deceased. He thus submits that the alleged injuries are not corroborated by the medical evidence on record. Counsel

further contends that in the alleged occurrence, the Petitioner also suffered grievous injury on his body. He has pointed out that co-accused Talvir

Singh has already been granted bail by this Court vide order dated July 3, 2004, passed in CrI. Misc. No. 10412-M of 2004. Counsel for the

Petitioner further contends that PW-7 Mohinder Singh driver, who was present at the time of the alleged occurrence, has not supported the

prosecution version.

5. In the facts and circumstances of the case, since the Petitioner is in custody since 8.5.2001 and in spite of the direction given by this Court, trial

has not been expedited, as the prosecution is delaying the matter and keeping in view the right of the accused of speedy trial, I deem it appropriate

to grant bail to the Petitioner.

Bail to the satisfaction of the trial court.