

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

CRM-M-10681-2015 (O&M)
Date of decision : 26.10.2016

Ravi @ Ravi Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. APS Deol, Sr. Advocate,
with Mr. Kartar Singh Malik (I), Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Saurabh Mohunta, DAG, Haryana,
assisted by ASI Rajveer Singh.

JITENDRA CHAUHAN, J. (Oral)

The instant petition has been preferred under Section 439 Cr.P.C. seeking regular bail in FIR No.277 dated 30.08.2014, under Sections 397, 393, 307 and 302 of the Indian Penal Code, at P.S. Rajendra Park, Distt. Gurgaon.

Contents that the petitioner is not named in the FIR. He is behind the bars since 31.08.2014. The injured witness, Ram Parshad has not supported the case of the prosecution.

On the other hand, learned State counsel, on instructions, fairly concedes that Ram Parshad, the eye-witness, has not supported the prosecution version. He further informs that out of 28 prosecution witnesses, 15 have already been examined.

Heard.

Keeping in view the fact that the petitioner is not named in the FIR. He is in custody since 31.08.2014. The eye-witness has not supported the case of the prosecution. Out of 28 prosecution witnesses, only 15 have been examined so far, therefore, it can safely be inferred that the conclusion of the trial may take time.

In view of the above, without adverting to the merits of the instant case, this petition is allowed. The petitioner be admitted to bail during the pendency of the trial, on his furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds, to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

However, nothing noticed hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion of this Court, on the merits of the case.

26.10.2016
atulsethi

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking / reasoned :	Yes	No
Whether Reportable :	Yes	No