

268

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

CRM-M-31739 of 2016

Date of decision: September 14, 2016

Rahul alias Jadu

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.B. CHAUDHARI

Present: Mr. Anil Kumar Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Karan Sharma, AAG Haryana.

A.B. CHAUDHARI, J (Oral)

Heard learned counsel for the rival parties.

In FIR No.271 dated 23.04.2016, under Section 379-A of Indian Penal Code, 1860, registered at Police Station City Ballabgarh, District Faridabad, petitioner was arrested on 03.05.2016 and is in jail since then.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has pointed out that the co-accused from whom some cash was recovered has been granted bail by the trial Judge.

I have seen the order made by the trial Judge so also the reasons stated therein.

Learned State counsel opposes the bail petition on the ground that a bag was recovered from the petitioner along with some cash.

I do not think that there can be any difference in the nature

of offence for finding out the parity in the matter of grant of bail. The same reasons should also apply in the present case as in the case of co-accused given by the trial Judge.

In that view of the matter, this petition is allowed. Petitioner be released on bail subject to the satisfaction of the Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned and subject to the conditions as imposed by the trial Judge in its order dated 10.08.2016 in the case of co-accused. Petitioner shall not tamper with the prosecution evidence and shall not threaten the prosecution witnesses.

(A.B. CHAUDHARI)
JUDGE

September 14, 2016

mahavir

Whether speaking/ reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No