

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

CRM No.M-7071 of 2016

Date of decision: 04.07.2016

Sunil

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. Kamal Chaudhary, Advocate for
Mr. Gaurav Singla, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Saurabh Mohunta, DAG, Haryana
assisted by SI Rajbir Singh.

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 case FIR No.19, dated 10.02.2015, registered under Sections 302, 201, 392, 120-B, 212, 195A and 148 read with Sections 34 and 149 of the Indian Penal Code (for short 'IPC') and Section 25 of Arms Act, at Police Station Chhainsa, District Faridabad.

It is contended that the petitioner has not been named in the FIR and subsequently, on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused, Manoj, he has been falsely implicated in the instant case.

On the other hand, the learned State counsel opposes the

prayer of bail and states that the petitioner played an active role in the commission of crime. The weapons of offence i.e. pistol, rod and country made pistol used in the crime were provided by the present petitioner. He further states that the petitioner has been convicted in another FIR No.314 of 2009, under Sections 302, 120-B IPC and Section 25 of Arms Act.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

Keeping in view the antecedents of the petitioner and the fact that the petitioner is the main conspirator who allegedly provided weapons to his co-accused, no case for bail is made out at this stage.

Dismissed.

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

04.07.2016

sumit.k

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE