

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

Criminal Misc. No. M-18997 of 2016
Date of Decision: 27.07.2016

Sandeep

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent(s)

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARI PAL VERMA

Present:- Mr. Rakesh Nehra, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Manish Bansal, DAG, Haryana.

HARI PAL VERMA J.(Oral)

Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.389 dated 2.11.2012 under Sections 302/201 IPC and Section 25 Arms Act registered at Police Station Sampla, District Rohtak.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is in custody since 9.3.2013 and all the co-accused of the petitioner, including Sanjeet @ Sonu, have been admitted on bail by the trial Court vide order dated 19.7.2016. He claims parity with Sanjeet @ Sonu, the allegation against whom is that he fired a shot from his pistol on deceased Vinod.

Learned State counsel, on instructions from HC Anil Kumar, does not dispute the fact that co-accused of the petitioner namely Sanjeet @ Sonu, who has fired shot from his pistol on the deceased Vinod, has been admitted on bail. He further submits that in the instant case, the trial is going to be concluded soon, as 32 out of 39 witnesses have already been examined.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties.

It is not disputed that co-accused of the petitioner namely Sanjeet @ Sonu has been admitted on bail on 19.7.2016. Therefore, considering the fact that the petitioner is in custody since 9.3.2013, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is admitted on regular bail subject to furnishing of his bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

It is made clear that expression made hereinabove shall not be construed as any opinion on the merits of the case.

July 27, 2016
AK

(HARI PAL VERMA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking / reasoned?

Yes / No

Whether reportable?

Yes / No