

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

**Sr. No.210**

**CRM-M No.5469 of 2017**

**Date of decision: 24.05.2017**

Ankur @ Ankit

....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana

....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK SIBAL**

Present: Mr. Surinder Singh Duhan, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Manish Bansal, DAG, Haryana.

\* \* \*

**DEEPAK SIBAL, J. (Oral)**

Through the present petition filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C., the petitioner seeks regular bail in FIR No.705 dated 18.08.2016, registered under Sections 302 & 120-B read with Section 34 IPC and Section 25 of Arms Act, at Police Station City Jind, District Jind.

Seeking regular bail for the petitioner, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the case; the petitioner is a young man of 20 years of age; he is a student, who only last year has passed his 10+2 examination; there is no other criminal case in which the petitioner is involved; he has been in custody for the last about 09 months; the allegations against the petitioner are that about a week prior to the alleged murder of the deceased, the petitioner had threatened him with dire consequences, however, there is no evidence on record to link the petitioner with the crime and that since till date even charges have not been framed and there are 15 witnesses cited by the prosecution, the trial is not likely to conclude in the near future.

Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Surinder Kumar does not dispute that there is no other case against the petitioner; he has been in custody for last about 09 months and that the trial is not likely to conclude in the near future. However, the prayer made by the petitioner is opposed on the ground that he is charged with murder.

Since the petitioner is a young man of 20 years of age; there is no other criminal case in which the petitioner is involved; he is a student, who passed his 10+2 examination only last year; no injury is attributed to him; in fact he is not even said to be present at the spot of occurrence and the trial is not likely to be concluded in the near future, I am of the opinion that the petitioner deserves to be admitted to regular bail.

Bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

The trial Court is directed to insist upon heavy local sureties.

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

It is clarified that in case the petitioner is found indulging in any other criminal activity; influencing witnesses; tampering with evidence or while in any condition under Section 439 Cr.P.C., the State/complainant would be at liberty to approach this Court to seek cancellation of bail granted to the petitioner through this order.

**(DEEPAK SIBAL)**  
**JUDGE**

**May 24, 2017**  
*Jyoti 1*

|                                      |               |
|--------------------------------------|---------------|
| <i>(i) Whether speaking/reasoned</i> | <i>Yes/No</i> |
| <i>(ii) Whether reportable</i>       | <i>Yes/No</i> |