

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

**CRM-M-16254 of 2015  
Date of Decision:17.7.2015**

Surender @ Sunder

--Petitioner.

Vs.

State of Haryana

--Respondent.

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK**

Present : Mr. Gulam Nabi Malik, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

\*\*\*\*

**RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK J. (ORAL)**

Petitioner seeks bail pending trial in FIR No. 165 dated 7.7.2014 under Sections 306/120-B IPC, registered at Police Station Beri, District Jhajjar.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. Ashish Yadav, Additional A.G. Haryana, accepts notice.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. Petitioner had no role to play. He further submits that initially, the petitioner was declared innocent, however, without seeking permission of the Court, investigating agency implicated the petitioner again, which was not permissible in law. He next contended that since the prosecution evidence is still going on, conclusion of trial will take long time. He

prays for allowing the present petition.

On the other hand, learned counsel for the State, on instructions from Satyavir Singh, submits that petitioner has been specifically named by the deceased himself in a detailed suicide note as well as in the FIR. The allegations against the petitioner are direct and specific. He further submits that involvement of the petitioner in the commission of crime is duly established on record. He would next contend that after framing of charge, 6 PWs have been examined and all of them have supported the prosecution version. He concluded by submitting that in such a situation, it cannot be said the trial is being delayed by the prosecuting agency. He prays for dismissal of the present petition.

Having heard the learned counsel for the parties, after careful perusal of the record of the case and giving thoughtful consideration to the rival contentions raised, this Court is of the considered opinion that in the given fact situation of the present case, petitioner has not been found entitled for the concession of bail pending trial. It is so said, because allegations against the petitioner are not only direct and specific but serious as well. The prosecution witnesses, whosoever, has been examined so far, have supported the prosecution version. Thus, as on date, nothing has been found in favour of the petitioner on the basis of which he may claim that he was innocent. Further, no delay has been alleged by the learned counsel for the petitioner in conducting the trial by the prosecuting agency. As many as 6 PWs have been examined and next date of hearing before the learned trial court is 29.7.2015.

In view of the above and without commenting anything further on the merits of the case, lest it should prejudice the rights of either of the parties, no case for bail pending trial is made out.

Dismissed.

**(RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK)**  
**JUDGE**

17.7.2015  
AK Sharma