

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

Sr. No.214

CRM-M No.11110 of 2017

Date of decision: 06.04.2017

Karambir @ Sunghu

....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK SIBAL

Present: Mr. Devinder Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Manish Bansal, DAG, Haryana.

* * *

DEEPAK SIBAL, J. (Oral)

Through the present petition filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C., the petitioner seeks regular bail in FIR No.195 dated 26.04.2016, registered under Sections 302, 201, 120-B, 109, 328 IPC, at Police Station Sadar Bahadurgarh, District Jhajjar.

Seeking regular bail for the petitioner, learned counsel submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the case; there is no evidence against him; he has been in custody since 01.05.2016; 10 prosecution witnesses remain to be examined and the trial is likely to take long time to conclude.

Opposing the grant of regular bail, learned State counsel submitted that the petitioner alongwith his co-accused not only murdered his lover's husband but also brutally cut the body into pieces before stashing it in a suit case.

After considering the rival submissions while declining the prayer for the grant of bail, I am of the opinion that in the peculiar facts of the case, the ends of justice would be met, if the prosecution is directed to conclude its entire evidence within five months from the next date fixed before the trial Court. The trial Court is also requested to pass final order in the trial within one month thereafter.

The above directions, of course, are subject to the cooperation by the petitioner and his co-accused.

In case, the trial is not concluded within the above time bound frame, the petitioner would be at liberty to revive his prayer for regular bail.

The petition stands disposed off in the above terms.

(DEEPAK SIBAL)
JUDGE

April 06, 2017
Jyoti 1

<i>(i) Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>(ii) Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>