

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

Sr. No. 207

CRM-M-37692-2016

Decided on : 20.02.2017

Sonu @ Kishan Singh

..... Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Haryana

..... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK SIBAL

Present: Mr. Keshav Pratap Singh, Advocate, for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Ashish Yadav, Addl. A. G., Haryana.

. . .

DEEPAK SIBAL, J. (ORAL)

Through the present petition filed under Section 439 Cr. P. C., the petitioner seeks the concession of regular bail in FIR No. 213, dated 23.08.2014, registered under Sections 323, 324, 307, 506 and 34 IPC, at Police Station Bawal, District Rewari.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been in custody for over two years and one month; till date only 4 out of 13 prosecution witnesses have been examined; the trial is likely to take a long time to conclude; there is no other criminal case pending against him; two of the eye-witnesses have already been examined and no useful purpose would be served by keeping him in jail.

Learned State counsel opposes the bail application on the ground that there are serious allegations against the petitioner.

Finding merit in the submissions of learned counsel for the petitioner, it is directed that the petitioner be admitted to regular bail subject to the satisfaction Trial Court/Duty Magistrate, Rewari.

In the peculiar facts of the case, it is further directed that the State shall make every endeavour to examine all the remaining prosecution witnesses expeditiously but not later than three months from the next date fixed before the trial court and thereafter the petitioner shall also lead his defence evidence expeditiously without causing any unwarranted delay.

While on bail if the petitioner is found indulging in any other criminal activity/misusing the concession of bail, it will be open to the State to move an appropriate application before the competent court for cancellation of the granted bail to the petitioner through this order.

Nothing observed herein-above shall be considered to be an expression of opinion by this Court on the merits of the case.

20.02.2017  
shamsher

**[ DEEPAK SIBAL ]**  
**JUDGE**

|                           |   |          |
|---------------------------|---|----------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned | : | Yes / No |
| Whether reportable        | : | Yes / No |