

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

CRM -M-37368 of 2016 (O&M)

Date of decision: 25.10.2016

Sanju

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. K.S. Malik-I, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Saurabh Mohunta, DAG, Haryana.

Jitendra Chauhan, J. (Oral)

By filing the present petition, under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, the petitioner has sought regular bail in FIR No. 297 dated 04.07.2015, registered under Sections 356 and 379 of IPC, at Police Station Urban Estate, Rohtak, District Rohtak.

It is contended that the petitioner is not named in the FIR and the petitioner has been falsely implicated on the basis of suspicion alone. The petitioner is behind the bars for the last nine months

On the other hand, the learned State counsel opposes the bail application and states that the petitioner is habitual offender and he is involved in two similar FIRs but he is on bail.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused

the record.

Considering the fact that the petitioner is named in the FIR; the challan stands presented; out of total 14 PWs, only 07 PWs have been examined so far; therefore, it can safely be inferred that the trial is not likely to be concluded in the near future, without advertng to the merits of the instant case, this petition is allowed. The petitioner be admitted to bail during the pendency of trial, on his furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds, to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

Anything said herein above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

25.10.2016

sumit.k

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes	No
Whether Reportable :	Yes	No