

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

**CRM-M No.10803 of 2017
Date of Decision: 05.04.2017**

Vikram Singh Negi

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM:-HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH

Present:Mr. A.K. Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. P.P. Chahar, DAG, Haryana.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J.(ORAL)

Petitioner seeks grant of regular bail under Section 439 Cr.P.C in case bearing FIR No.26 dated 08.01.2015 registered under Sections 392/397/342/411/120-B IPC and Sections 25/54/59 of the Arms Act at Police Station City Karnal, District Karnal.

Name of the petitioner came to fore only on account of disclosure statement of Mehtab @ Kanha @ Jeeva wherein he stated that none of the accused were having address of Delhi, so they associated the petitioner for the purchase of a car. Accordingly, the car was purchased in the name of the petitioner on his address of Delhi.

Evidently, the petitioner was not named in the FIR along with other accused, who were instrumental in giving effect to the robbery. As per disclosure statement of Mehtab @ Kanha @ Jeeva, he along with Naushad, Mehndi Hassan, Sadar Khan @ Rehan,

Israr, Sabir and Sunder jointly came to the office Ragman and took the keys of locker from the person sitting there on pistol point and thereafter, looted the cash.

Learned State counsel on instructions from ASI Jitender Singh admits that the petitioner was not amongst those persons who had looted the firm, but the complicity of the petitioner is in respect of purchasing the car from the booty received from the aforesaid robbery. At the most, the complicity of the petitioner can be alleged in terms of Section 412 IPC.

The case appears to be arguable. Petitioner is in custody since 25.06.2015. The trial may take some time in its culmination.

In view of the above, without adverting to the merits of the case, it will be just and expedient to grant concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

Let the petitioner be enlarged on bail, subject to his furnishing adequate bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

Nothing expressed hereinabove would be construed to be an expression of any opinion on merits of the case.

(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE

05.04.2017
prince

Whether Reasoned/Speaking

Yes/No

Whether Reportable

Yes/No