

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

Sr. No.207

CRM-M No.6086 of 2017
Date of decision: 18.05.2017

Surender

....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK SIBAL

Present: Mr. Sandeep Lather, Advocate
for the petitioner.

* * *

DEEPAK SIBAL, J. (Oral)

Through the present petition filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C., the petitioner seeks regular bail in FIR No.009 dated 14.01.2017, registered under Sections 25/54/59 of Arms Act, at Police Station Uklana, District Hisar.

The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner was found in possession of a rifle for which he could not produce a licence.

Seeking regular bail for the petitioner, learned counsel submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the case; the recovered rifle belongs to his friend who has a licence for the same; the petitioner has been in custody for the last over 04 months and that since no prosecution witness has been examined till date, the trial is not likely to conclude in the near future.

Learned State counsel has admitted that till date no prosecution witness has been examined and has also not disputed the period of custody of the petitioner.

After considering the above rival submissions, I am of the opinion that the petitioner deserves to be admitted to regular bail.

Bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

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

If the petitioner is found indulging in any criminal act or misusing the concession of bail granted by this Court, it would be open to the State to seek cancellation of bail granted through this order by filing an appropriate application before the competent Court/this Court.

(DEEPAK SIBAL)
JUDGE

May 18, 2017

Jyoti 1

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