

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-37134 of 2015

Date of decision: November 28, 2015

Vinay

..... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M. JEYAPPAUL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DARSHAN SINGH**

Present: Mr. D.S. Bali, Sr. Advocate with
Parveen Jain, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Gaurav Jindal, Additional AG, Haryana.

1. Whether reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?
2. To be referred to the reporters or not?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest?

M. JEYAPPAUL, J. (ORAL)

Heard the submissions made by learned counsel appearing for the petitioner as well as learned State counsel.

This Bench was pleased to dismiss the application filed by the petitioner seeking bail by virtue of order dated 23.02.2015.

Bail is sought on two grounds, firstly, the petitioner has been in incarceration for the past one year and one month and secondly, the trial of the case is not going to conclude in the near future, inasmuch as only 25 witnesses out of 89 have been examined so far. It is submitted, in the above background, by learned senior counsel appearing for the petitioner that the petitioner is ready to abide by any stringent condition that may be imposed.

Of course, the learned State counsel vehemently opposed the application for bail sought for by the petitioner.

We find that the trial Court is taking all out efforts to complete the trial. It is true that substantial witnesses have to be examined in this case but that cannot be a ground for granting bail to the petitioner. We also find that there is no substantial change of circumstances from the date when earlier application moved by the petitioner for bail was rejected.

The petition stands dismissed.

(M. JEYAPPAUL)
JUDGE

(DARSHAN SINGH)
JUDGE

November 28, 2015
Dinesh Bansal