

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

CRM-M-35626-2014 (O&M)

Date of Decision: January 22, 2015

Parveen Kumar

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NARESH KUMAR SANGHI

Present: Mr.Naveen Daryal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr.Kapil Aggarwal, Additional Advocate General,
Haryana.

.....

Naresh Kumar Sanghi, J.(Oral)

Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 439, Cr.P.C.,
is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, Parveen Kumar, who
has been booked for having committed the offences punishable
under Sections 120-B, 307 and 420, IPC, and Section 25 of the
Arms Act in a case arising out of FIR No.428, dated 26.11.2013,
registered at Police Station, Sadar, Rohtak.

Learned counsel contends that the name of the
petitioner had emerged in the disclosure statement of his co-
accused Smt.Babita, who has already been granted bail by the

Court below. He further contends that there is no evidence on record to connect the petitioner with the alleged offences.

On the other hand the learned counsel for the State, on instructions from HC Ved Pal of Police Station, Sadar, Rohtak, submits that on 12.01.2014 the petitioner along with his co-accused went to the house of injured Dharmender and confessed his guilt and, as such there is extra judicial confession against the petitioner; after the arrest of the petitioner .315 country made pistol, one live cartridge as well as the motor-cycle used for commission of the offence were recovered. The said pistol was sent to Forensic Science Laboratory, Madhuban, and the report has come which further connects the petitioner with the commission of the offences and that there was motive on the part of the petitioner to cause injuries to injured Dharmender. He contends that injury found on the person of Dharmender would clearly reveal that the same is attracting the mischief of Section 307, IPC.

After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and going through the material available on record, there is sufficient material to connect the petitioner with the offences for which he has been booked. The trial is going on. The statement of the

injured has yet to be recorded by learned trial Court. Therefore, no ground for grant of bail to the petitioner is made out at this stage.

Dismissed.

January 22, 2015
meenu

(NARESH KUMAR SANGHI)
JUDGE