

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

CRM No.M-18045 of 2017 (O&M)

Date of Decision: July 05, 2017

Vijay @ Sonu

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

Present: Ms.Sharmila Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr.B.S.Virk, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana
for the respondent-State.

INDERJIT SINGH, J.

Petitioner has filed this petition under Section 439 Cr.P.C. for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.167 dated 20.08.2015 under Sections 302, 201, 396 IPC and Section 25 of the Arms Act, registered at Police Station Lakhan Majra, District Rohtak.

Notice of motion was issued. Learned State counsel appeared and contested the petition.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned State counsel and have gone through the record.

From the record, I find that FIR was registered on the statement of Narender, who stated that his nephew Vishal Yadav had come to Hisar on 18.08.2015 in connection with some company work in his car HR-26BF-

0192. At about 4.30 p.m., complainant side received telephonic call from him that he has started from Hisar and will reach home by 9.00 p.m. When the complainant side called back Vishal, his phone was found switched off. On 20.08.2015 dead body of Vishal was recovered from Lakhan Majra Canal with deep cut injury on the head and many injuries on the body. It is also in the FIR that Vishal has been killed and car was taken away and with intention to destroy the evidence, the dead body was thrown in the canal.

The present petitioner is nominated in the present case along with other accused and after investigation challan was presented against them. Learned State counsel argued that present petitioner played active role in the commission of the offence and 26 witnesses have already been examined out of 56 witnesses.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case and in view of the nature and gravity of the offence, I do not find it a fit case where petitioner is entitled to benefit of regular bail.

Therefore, finding no merit in the present petition, the same is dismissed.

However, as the petitioner is stated to have been in custody since 18.08.2015, therefore, learned trial Court is directed to expedite the trial by giving short adjournments and if required, even day to day adjournments. The Investigating Officer/SHO concerned is directed to produce the remaining witnesses before the trial Court at the earliest.

July 05, 2017
Vgulati

(INDERJIT SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes
No