

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh

.....

Criminal Misc. No.M-17215 of 2018

.....

Date of decision:24.8.2018

Saurabh Sharma

...Petitioner

v.

State of Haryana

...Respondent

....

**Coram: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Inderjit Singh**

.....

Present: Mr. Anupam Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Sukhdeep Parmar, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana for  
the respondent-State.

.....

**Inderjit Singh, J.**

The petitioner has filed this second petition under Section 439 Cr.P.C. for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.77 dated 6.8.2016 registered for the offences under Sections 148, 149, 323, 324, 307, 302 and 120-B IPC and Section 25 of the Arms Act at Police Station Panjokhra, District Ambala.

Notice of motion has been issued in this case.

Mr. Sukhdeep Parmar, learned Deputy Advocate General, Haryana has appeared on behalf of the respondent-State and contested this petition.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned State counsel and have gone through the record.

As per the allegations, the present petitioner is named in the FIR and has been stated to be armed with knife. Another co-accused is also stated to be armed with knife. There are two injured also in this case.

Learned State counsel argued that one of the witnesses Anoop Singh during trial reported to the Police that threat was given to him regarding dire consequences in case he appears as witness in the trial Court and he was provided security of two Police escort guards for his protection and ultimately on 23.7.2018 said witness in Police escort appeared in the trial Court for deposition, but on his verbal request, he being sick and unfit to give evidence, his evidence was not recorded and the trial was adjourned for conclusion of remaining evidence to be concluded on 26.7.2018. Later on, this witness has been examined.

Keeping in view the nature and gravity of the offences, serious allegations in the FIR and further as per reply a threat was also given to the witness, there is every chance to tamper with the evidence.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, nature and gravity of the offences, I do not find it a fit case where the present petitioner is entitled to the benefit of regular bail.

Therefore, finding no merit in this petition, the same is dismissed.

August 24, 2018.

**(Inderjit Singh)**  
**Judge**

\*hsp\*

|              |                            |     |
|--------------|----------------------------|-----|
| <b>NOTE:</b> | Whether speaking/reasoned: | Yes |
|              | Whether reportable:        | No  |