

**CRM No.M-24969 of 2017**

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

**CRM No.M-24969 of 2017**  
Date of Decision:21.07.2017

Rakesh alias Sonu

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH**

Present: Mr. V.D.Sharma, Advocate,  
for the petitioner.

Mr. B.S.Virk, DAG, Haryana.

\*\*\*\*

**INDERJIT SINGH, J.**

Petitioner-Rakesh alias Sonu has filed this 2<sup>nd</sup> petition under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.275, dated 30.09.2016, registered at Police Station Ellenabad, District Sirsa, under Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959 and Sections 186, 189, 224, 225, 307, 332, 177, 353, 411, 412, 420, 467, 468, 471, 147, 149, 397 and 120-B of the Indian Penal Code.

Notice of motion has been issued in this case. Learned State counsel has put in appearance on behalf of the respondent-State and contested the instant petition.

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

**CRM No.M-24969 of 2017**

From the record, I find that as per the prosecution version, FIR, in the present case, was registered on the statement of EASI Sanjay Kumar. As per the complainant's version, when he was producing accused Sanjit @ Shakti @ Sumit in the Court at Ellenabad, then one person standing there sprayed in his eyes and one another person standing nearby thrown red chilly powder in the eyes of Constable Anil and got freed accused Sanjit @ Shakti from the police custody. In the meantime, two other persons standing there also started firing upon the police officials with an intention to kill them and one fire hit below the left knee of complainant and thereafter, the accused fled away from the spot in the nearby fields. The police officials chased the accused and also fired in the air and caught hold two persons, one named as Ravi and another named as Sunny. During the investigation, the present petitioner was also arrested in the present case and he suffered the disclosure statement showing his involvement in the offence.

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

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

**21.07.2017**

parveen kumar

**(INDERJIT SINGH)  
JUDGE**

|              |                           |   |     |
|--------------|---------------------------|---|-----|
| <b>Note:</b> | Whether speaking/reasoned | : | Yes |
|              | Whether reportable        | : | No  |