

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

CRM-M-48473 of 2017 (O&M)

Date of decision: 27.02.2018

Gurdarshan Singh @ Darshan

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. Sandeep Gahlawat, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Ramakant Sharma, AAG, Haryana
assisted by ASI Ashok Kumar.

Jitendra Chauhan, J. (Oral)

By filing the present petition under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, the petitioner has sought regular bail in FIR No.28 dated 17.01.2015, registered under Sections 302, 303, 120-B read with Section 34 of IPC and Section 25 of Arms Act, at Police Station Mahesh Nagar, District Ambala.

Learned counsel refers to Annexure P-14 to P-18, the testimonies of the prosecution witnesses to contend that the material witnesses including the complainant have been examined who have not supported the prosecution version. The petitioner is in custody since 17.01.2015.

On the other hand, the learned State counsel opposes the

bail application.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

This is the fourth bail petition filed on behalf of the petitioner. As per Annexure R-1, the petitioner is involved in as many as 18 cases. Except the fact that certain material witnesses have been examined, the learned counsel for the petitioner has not been able to point out any other fresh circumstance in favour of the petitioner. Considering the antecedents of the petitioner, no case for regular bail is made out. The trial Court shall take the relevant facts into consideration at an appropriate stage.

Dismissed.

Anything said herein above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

27.02.2018

sumit.k

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes	No
Whether Reportable :	Yes	No