

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

209

CRM-M-23605-2017.

Date of Decision: 31.07.2017.

Harish Kumar

....Petitioner.

Versus

State of Haryana

....Respondent.

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMENDRA JAIN

Present: Mr. Pankaj Middha, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Surender Singh, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana.

Ramendra Jain, J.(Oral)

Prayer in the instant petition under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure has been made for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case F.I.R. No.705 dated 18.08.2016 under Section 302/34 I.P.C. and section 25,54,59 of the Arms Act registered at Police Station City Jind, District Jind.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that no role whatsoever has been attributed to the petitioner. According to the complainant, he had seen the petitioner while running away with co-accused Bijender, who with his pistol had fired shot upon the son of the complainant, namely, Paras. The co-accused, namely, Ankur @ Ankit, who had threatened the deceased on telephone, has already been granted regular bail. The case of the petitioner is on parity with aforesaid Ankur @ Ankit, because both of them had been booked under Section 120-B I.P.C.

alongwith main accused Bijender.

On the other hand, learned counsel for the State opposed the prayer of the petitioner.

Considering the fact that co-accused Ankur @ Ankit, whose case is on the same footing as that of the petitioner, has been granted bail and also the fact that the petitioner is in custody since 28.08.2016 i.e. more than 11 months and no role has been attributed to the petitioner in the F.I.R., the petitioner is also granted regular bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court.

Without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the petition stands disposed of.

(RAMENDRA JAIN)
JUDGE

31.07.2017
jitender

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

CRM-M No.23505 of 2017

It has been brought to my notice that in the order dated 31.07.2017 passed in CRM-M-23505 of 2017 on the top of 1st page the case number has been wrongly mentioned as “CRM-M No.23605 of 2017” instead of “CRM-M No.23505 of 2017”. In the order dated 31.07.2017, on the 1st page, the case number be read as “CRM-M No.23505 of 2017” in place of “CRM-M No.23605 of 2017”.

1.8.2017

(Ramendra Jain)
Judge