

CRM-M-37440-2016

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

CRM-M-37440-2016

Date of Decision: 04.11.2016

Yoganand

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

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

Mr. Vikas Chopra, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

INDERJIT SINGH, J.

Petitioner, Yoganand, has filed this petition under Section 439 Cr.P.C. for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.173 dated 04.05.2016, registered at Police Station Sampla, District Rohtak, under Sections 302, 120-B, 476 and 34 IPC and Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959.

Notice of motion was issued. Learned State counsel put in appearance on behalf of the respondent-State and contested this petition.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned State counsel and have gone through the record.

From the record, I find that the present petitioner has not been named in the FIR. No allegations have been levelled against him. The present petitioner was nominated on the basis of disclosure statement made by co-accused, Rajesh, during the investigation. It is argued that co-accused

CRM-M-37440-2016

Rajesh has already been released on bail. Challan has already been presented. The main evidence against the present petitioner is the disclosure statement of co-accused, Rajesh.

The petitioner has been in custody since 05.05.2016. He is not required for any investigation or interrogation purposes as he is in judicial custody. The trial of the case will take long time. No useful purpose will be served by keeping the petitioner in custody till the final disposal of the case.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case; without discussing the facts in minute detail and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, this criminal miscellaneous petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail subject to his furnishing personal bonds in the sum of ₹50,000/- with one surety in the like amount to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

04.11.2016

parveen kumar

**(INDERJIT SINGH)
JUDGE**

Note:	Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes
	Whether reportable	:	No