

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

Crl. Misc. No. M-13999 of 2015

Date of decision : July 09, 2015

Manish

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE ANITA CHAUDHRY

Present: Mr. Rakesh Nehra, Advocate
for the petitioner

Mr. Deepak K. Grewal, DAG Haryana

ANITA CHAUDHRY, J.(ORAL)

The petitioner is seeking regular bail in FIR No. 414 dated 25.11.2012 registered under Sections 307/353/186 IPC and Section 25 of the Arms Act at Police Station Sampla, District Rohtak.

The allegations against the petitioner are that secret information was received that the accused armed with illegal weapons was waiting for some persons and could be nabbed. The police party went to the spot. The accused fired at them though no one was hurt. The police party also fired and it hit on the leg. The petitioner was secured.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that first bail application was filed in January 2015 and the petition was disposed of with a direction to the trial Court to conclude the evidence on three dates failing which the petitioner shall make an application for grant of regular bail. He further contends that no adjournment was taken by the accused and the evidence had not been completed and the

petitioner moved an application for bail and the Court even failed to refer to the High Court order and had dismissed the same.

Status report has been placed on record which shows number of cases registered against the petitioner. Two cases under Section 302 IPC are also pending against the petitioner. The petitioner has also been convicted in two matters in which he has undergone the complete sentence whereas he is in custody in other cases.

Learned State counsel submits that the petitioner is a habitual offender and bail should not be allowed. He has referred to the number of cases mentioned in the status report.

The petitioner is wanted in number of cases. He had fired at police party who returned the fire. Considering the above, I would dispose of the petition with a direction to the trial Court to expedite the trial and would complete the trial within three months from 31.7.2015. State would ensure that service on the official witnesses is effected. The zimni orders show that service was not being effected on the official respondents. The petitioner would not seek adjournment and would ensure presence of his counsel.

July 09, 2015

reena

**(ANITA CHAUDHRY)
JUDGE**