

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

CRM-M-3714-2017 (O&M)
Date of decision: 15.03.2017

Mahesh @ Naresh

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

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

Mr. Saurabh Mohunta, DAG, Haryana

Mr. Davinder Lubana, Advocate
for the complainant.

Jitendra Chauhan, J. (Oral)

By filing the present petition under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, the petitioner has sought regular bail in FIR No.709 dated 19.08.2016, registered under Sections 384, 407 and 420 IPC and Section 120-B IPC (added later on), at Police Station Karnal Sadar, Distt. Karnal.

Contentends that the only allegation against the petitioner is that he allegedly made a phone call to the complainant to pay Rs.8 lakh for return of the goods i.e. apple loaded in the trucks owned by co-accused, Mohan Singh. The petitioner is in custody since 22.09.2016.

On the other hand, the learned State counsel vehemently

opposes the present petition and states that challan stands presented and out of 17 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined so far.

Heard.

Considering the role attributed to the petitioner; he is in custody since 22.09.2016; challan has been filed; out of 17 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined so far, trial is likely to take a long time, therefore, no purpose would be served in keeping the petitioner behind the bars, without adverting to the merits of the instant case, this petition is allowed. The petitioner be admitted to bail during the pendency of the trial, on his furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds, to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

Anything said herein above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

15.03.2017

ashok

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes / No

Whether reportable: Yes / No