

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

243

CRM-M-11013-2017 (O&M)

Date of decision: 07.04.2017

AJAY

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present : Mr. Chirag Kundu, Advocate
for the petitioner (s).

Mr. Naveen Kaushik, Addl. A.G., Haryana

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 FIR No. 135 dated 15.05.2014, registered under Sections 364-A, 387 and 120-B IPC and Section 25 of the Arms Act, at Police Station Kalanaur, District Rohtak.

Contents that allegedly the petitioner has been allegedly involved in the FIR on the basis of recovery of sim phone, dress of the alleged kidnapped child and a Alto Car, from the petitioner. Whereas, as per the statement of the victim, he was kidnapped in the Santro car. The owner of the vehicle, co-accused Rohit @ Ravit has been enlarged on bail vide order dated 30.05.2016 by the Co-ordinate Bench. All the material witnesses have been examined and the petitioner is not involved in any other FIR, which is duly acknowledged by the learned State counsel. The petitioner is in custody since 20.05.2014.

On the other hand, the learned State counsel vehemently opposes the present petition and states that out of 26 prosecution witnesses, 12 have been examined so far.

Heard.

Considering the facts that all the material witnesses have been examined; the petitioner is in custody since 20.05.2014; co-accused, Rohit @ Ravish has been admitted to bail; he is not involved in any other FIR; out of 26 PWs, only 12 PWs have been examined so far, therefore, it can be safely inferred that the trial is not likely to be concluded in the near future, without adverting to the merits of the instant case, this petition is allowed. The petitioner be admitted to bail during the pendency of trial, on his furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

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

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

07.04.2017
ashok

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