

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

CRM-M No.29027 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of decision: 14.09.2016

Hukam Chand

.... Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana

.... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI

Present: Mr. H.N.Sahu, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Satish Saini, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Manoj K. Tanwar, Advocate
for the complainant.

Ajay Tewari, J.(Oral)

The petitioner prays for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.1272 dated 06.12.2014 registered under Sections 302, 34 IPC and Sections 25, 54 and 59 of Arms Act (Section 120-B IPC added later on) at Police Station Gurgaon City.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that as per the allegations the son of the petitioner and two of his friends have shot the deceased in bazar. He further submits that Section 120-B IPC was added later on and the petitioner is in custody for the last more than one year.

Learned counsel for the complainant as well as State counsel have argued that the petitioner had in fact paid money for the killing of the deceased.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has countered by arguing that apart from the disclosure statement, there is no evidence that the petitioner has paid any money for killing of the deceased.

Learned State counsel is not in a position to deny this factual assertion.

In the circumstances, keeping in view the period of custody

already suffered by the petitioner and without going into the merits of the case, I do not deem it appropriate to deny him the concession of bail.

Bail to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Duty Magistrate,
Gurgaon

The present petition stands disposed of.

Since the main case has been decided, the pending criminal miscellaneous application, if any, also stands disposed of.

September 14, 2016
sonia

(AJAY TEWARI)
JUDGE

1. Whether speaking/reasoned?	Yes/No
2. Whether reportable?	Yes/No