

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

229

CRL. MISC. No.M-37849 OF 2016 (O&M)
DATE OF DECISION : 10th NOVEMBER, 2016

Raju @ Prince

.... **Petitioner**

Versus

State of Haryana

.... **Respondent**

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

* * * *

Present : Mr. Rajesh Lamba, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Arjun Singh Yadav, 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, 411
& 120-B 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 coaccused 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.

10th NOVEMBER, 2016
'raj'

(A. B. CHAUDHARI)
JUDGE

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