

206.

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

CRM-M-1796-2018

Date of Decision: 23.01.2018

Amit

.....Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana

....Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present: Mr. Manoj Bakshi, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J. (Oral)

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner never having been named at all in the FIR, his name is stated to have been subsequently disclosed upon a statement made by his co-accused, which learned State counsel does not deny.

A perusal of the FIR also bears out that though seven persons were specifically named by the complainant as are stated to have attacked his son, leading to his death, the petitioner, Amit son of Ram Phal, is not named therein.

Consequently, without making any comment on the actual role of the petitioner, which shall obviously be seen by the trial Court at the time of trial, I consider it appropriate to admit him to bail, upon his furnishing adequate bail and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

Ordered accordingly.

January 23, 2018

dharamvir

**(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : YES/NO
Whether Reportable : YES/NO