

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

CRM-M-45311-2016

Date of Decision: 11.01.2017

BALJIT SINGH

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

... Respondent

CORAM:-HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH

Present:Mr. G.S. Verma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Pradeep Prakash Chahar, D.A.G., Haryana

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J.(ORAL)

Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that three accused were involved in the present case. Raj Kumar co-accused was granted regular bail by the Sessions Court on 21.07.2016 from whom recovery of purse of the complainant was effected. The recovery of purse was not treated to be strong circumstance to deny benefit of regular bail to Raj Kumar. Moreover, in the absence of evidence with regard to identity of the car used in the occurrence, recovery of car was not prima facie treated to be conclusive. Co-accused Sukhbir Singh was also granted regular bail on 28.07.2016 from whom car was recovered which was not a stolen vehicle and the said recovery was also not treated to be a strong circumstance to deny benefit of regular bail to co-accused Sukkhbir Singh. The first bail application of the petitioner was withdrawn on

10.08.2016 from the trial Court. The second application was withdrawn on 26.08.2016 from the trial Court. The factum of withdrawal of earlier two applications was concealed by the petitioner from the trial Court. Ultimately, trial Court dismissed the regular bail on that premise.

Apparently, bail was not declined on merits. Petitioner seeks parity with those who have been granted regular bail keeping in view the period of incarceration since 02.05.2016.

Without meaning anything on the merits, this Court deems it appropriate to enlarge the petitioner on regular bail subject to furnishing adequate bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of trial Court.

Disposed of.

11.01.2017
prince

(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether Reasoned/Speaking

Yes/No

Whether Reportable

Yes/No