

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

(122)

CRM-M-5088-2016

Decided on: March 31, 2016.

Ranbir @ Raini

.... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

(2)

CRM-M-7749-2016 (O&M)

Decided on: March 31, 2016.

Sanju @ Karamvir

.... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.M.S. BEDI

Present: Mr. Nipun Vashist, Advocate,
for the petitioner in CRM-M-5088-2016.

Mr. Abhishek Yadav, Advocate,
for the petitioner in CRM-M-7749-2016.

Mr. C.S. Bakshi, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

M.M.S. BEDI, J (ORAL)

This order will dispose of two applications for grant of regular bail, one (CRM-M-5088-2016) filed by Ranbir @ Raini and the other (CRM-M-7749-2016) filed by Sanju @ Karamvir.

The FIR was registered at the instance of Saurabh Yadav alleging that he received a phone call that injured Kunal (his partner in property dealing) had been fired by some persons and was admitted in

hospital. When the complainant had gone to hospital, injured Kunal made a statement that on 15.09.2015 Kunal had telephonically asked petitioner Ranbir @ Raini to settle the dispute regarding the money transactions between Kunal and Sonu Nai and the petitioner invited Kunal to his plot for settlement. When Kunal reached there with one Inderjit, during course of conversation with Sonu, a dispute arise between Vipul and petitioner Ranbir @ Raini, as a result of which, co-accused Vipul fired gun shot on the face of Kunal and ran away. So far as petitioner Ranbir @ Raini is concerned, he is alleged to have a motive to assault Kunal on account of money dispute. So far as petitioner Sanju @ Karamvir is concerned, he allegedly conspired with the other accused and helped the main accused Vipul to flee from the spot.

Both the petitioners have not been attributed any specific injury but for the allegations that Sonu non-applicant, who happens to be brother of Sanju @ Karamvir, had procured the services of Vipul who has allegedly fired at Kunal.

Without expression of any opinion on merits of the case, it is sufficient to observe here that the injured has been discharged from the hospital and he had appeared before the Sessions Court to help Inder to seek bail by stating that the occurrence had taken place at spur of moment as is apparent from the order passed by Additional Sessions Judge dated 15.01.2016 granting bail to Inder.

The petitioners have been in custody w.e.f. 23.12.2015 and 11.12.2015 respectively. Challan has already been presented. The trial is likely to take a long time.

In view of said circumstances, the petitioners can be granted concession of bail.

Both the petitions are allowed. Petitioners are ordered to be released on bail on their furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

However, in order to avoid any tampering of the evidence, a condition is imposed that in case the petitioners make any attempt to threaten the witnesses or tamper with the evidence, it will be open to the complainant or the prosecution agency to seek cancellation of bail.

(M.M.S. BEDI)
JUDGE

March 31, 2016
harsha