

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

Crl. Misc. No. M-34509 of 2016

Date of Decision:-03.10.2016

Karambir Singh @ Karmu

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARI PAL VERMA

Present:- Mr.Randeep S. Dhull, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr.Manish Bansal, DAG, Haryana.

HARI PAL VERMA J.(Oral)

Prayer made in the present petition filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C. is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.69, dated 24.07.2016, for offence under Sections 406, 420, 120-B IPC, registered at Police Station, Naggal, Ambala.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner was working under the contractor as a Supervisor and is in custody since 24.07.2016. He further submits that the co-accused of the petitioner, namely, *Harpal Singh and Amit Kumar alias Sukh Raj* have already been admitted on regular bail by this Court vide orders dated 26.08.2016 and 23.09.2016 passed in CRM-M-No.29245 of 2016 titled as "Harpal Singh Vs. State of Haryana" and CRM-M-32134 of 2016 titled as "Amit Kumar alias Sukh Raj vs. State of Haryana" respectively.

Learned counsel for the State, on instructions from ASI-Balbir Singh, does not dispute the aforesaid facts and fairly states that the petitioner is working as a Supervisor under the contractor.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties.

Considering the fact that the petitioner is in custody since 24.07.2016, coupled with the fact that the co-accused of the petitioner, namely, *Harpal Singh and Amit Kumar alias Sukh Raj* have already been admitted on regular bail by this Court as well as the fact that trial in the case will take sufficient long time, as only challan has been presented in the case, I deem it appropriate to allow the present petition for grant of regular bail.

Accordingly, the present petition is accepted and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to their furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

It is made clear that expression made here-in-above shall not be construed as an expression on the merit of the case and the trial Court shall be at liberty to decide the case on the basis of available evidence.

(HARI PAL VERMA)
JUDGE

03.10.2016
Anjal

Whether speaking/reasoned?

Yes/No

Whether reportable?

Yes/No