

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

**CRM-M No.40645 of 2017
Date of Decision: 17.02.2018**

Satnam Singh @ Kale

.....Petitioner

Vs

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

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

Present: Mr. K.S. Dhaliwal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. M.D. Sharma, A.A.G., Haryana.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J.

Petitioner seeks grant of regular bail under Section 439 Cr.P.C in case bearing FIR No.41 dated 08.05.2017, registered under Sections 120B, 302, 216 IPC and Sections 25/54/59 of the Arms Act at Police Station Mansa Devi Complex, District Panchkula, Haryana.

The FIR was registered on the basis of complaint in writing submitted by the complainant Rupa Rani that on 08.05.2017 at about 11.30 a.m., she along with her son Amit Sharma went to temple for worship. After paying obeisance, the complainant and her son Amit Sharma were coming out of the

temple. When they were at some distance from their car, two boys with muffled faces came there and opened fire on his son. The boys fled away in a white car having yellow number plate. The complainant could not note down the number of the car. The then injured was removed to the PGI, Chandigarh, where he died due to injuries. The complainant raised suspicion regarding involvement of Sonu Shah, Gagan and Surjeet Bouncer on the basis of earlier incident of firing at Ramlila Ground, Phase 8 Mohali, which had occurred few days prior to the present incident.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is not involved in the case. His name was disclosed by the co-accused Amandeep Singh @ Mani, who had purchased country made pistol from him for a consideration of Rs.10,000/-. As per disclosure statement of co-accused Amandeep Singh @ Mani, Gagandeep Singh had told him that the weapon and vehicle could be arranged from Dalbir Singh through his friend Satnam Singh i.e. petitioner. Amandeep Singh @ Mani along with his friends bought pistol and cartridges from Satnam Singh and during *reki*, they came to know that Amit Sharma @ Meet used to come to temple of Mahadev on every Monday for paying obeisance.

By referring to the aforesaid disclosure statement,

learned counsel further submitted that the petitioner was not involved in doing *reki* of the deceased in any manner. Similarly, disclosure statements of Harjinder Singh, Manish, Deepu and the petitioner cannot be read beyond the involvement of the petitioner to the extent of providing fire arm for consideration. Challan has already been presented.

Though learned State counsel opposed the prayer for the grant of regular bail, but considering the facts and circumstances of the case at this stage, without adverting to the merits of the case, I deem it appropriate to grant concession of regular bail to the petitioner, who is in custody since 27.05.2017.

In view of above, petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be enlarged on bail, subject to his furnishing adequate bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

Nothing expressed hereinabove would be construed to be an expression of any opinion on merits of the case.

February 17, 2018

Atik

Whether speaking/reasoned

Whether reportable

**(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE**

Yes/No

Yes/No