

IN THE PUNJAB & HARYANA HIGH COURT AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-44072-2016

Date of decision : 16.02.2017

Naveen

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present: Mr.R.N.Lohan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vikas Chopra, DAG, Haryana.

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J.(ORAL)

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was actually never identified in the CCTV footage, whereas two other co-accused were so identified and the petitioner was arrested on the basis of the statement of the brother of the deceased, to the effect that he can give the names and addresses of all the three accused, though the brother is not an eye witness.

He further submits that the petitioner has been in custody since 24.11.2014, with the trial still not near conclusion.

Learned State counsel, on instructions, submits that the petitioner was not directly identified in the CCTV camera but has been named by the son and brother of the deceased.

Keeping in view the aforesaid fact, without making any comment on the merits, also seeing the period of custody of the petitioner, I

consider it appropriate to admit the petitioner to bail upon his furnishing adequate bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court, subject to his complying with all other conditions as would be laid down by that Court.

Disposed of.

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

February 16, 2017.
Davinder Kumar

Whether speaking / reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No