

211

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH****CRM-M-17817 of 2016****Date of decision: July 23, 2016**

Karan Chugh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.B. CHAUDHARI**Present:** Mr. L.S. Sidhu, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Tanushree Gupta, DAG Haryana.

Mr. Naresh Kaushik, Advocate
for the complainant.

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?

**********A.B. CHAUDHARI, J (Oral)**

Heard learned counsel for the rival parties.

Petitioner is in custody since 17.12.2015. Upon hearing the learned counsel for the parties, prima-facie it appears that there is no direct evidence against the petitioner in this case. The prosecution merely relied on circumstantial evidence. The other evidence is said to be that of last seen theory by the father, i.e. complainant and there is no likelihood of tampering the evidence.

Learned State counsel submits that the report of viscera has yet not been received.

In my opinion, the receipt of report of viscera may not detain this Court for granting bail in view of the detention of the petitioner for the last more than six months. However, prima-facie there is hardly any

evidence in this case.

In that view of the matter, this petition is allowed. The petitioner be released on bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court. The prosecution, ofcourse, is at liberty to collect the evidence and file challan. In case, it is found by the prosecution that there is any further evidence against the petitioner after the receipt of viscera report, liberty is reserved in favour of the prosecution to apply for modification of this order/cancellation of bail order.

(A.B. CHAUDHARI)
JUDGE

July 23, 2016
mahavir