

210 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

HEMLATA
2018.08.24 17:28
Attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

CRM-M-5821-2017 (O&M)
Date of decision:23.08.2018

Kewal Krishan Amrohi

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJBIR SEHRAWAT

Present: Mr. Sukhdev Singh Khokher, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Karan Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

RAJBIR SEHRAWAT, J. (ORAL)

Prayer in this petition is for cancellation of the bail pending trial, which was granted by Learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Ambala, vide order dated 30.08.2016 in case FIR No.182 dated 03.06.2016 under Sections 420, 406 and Section 120-B IPC.

It is contended by counsel for the petitioner that respondent No.2-accused is a habitual offender. He is involved in at least 3 more cases of similar nature, which involves, more than 01 crores of rupees. He further contends that the present petitioner, who has been defrauded by respondent No.2-accused, is a senior citizen, who has retired from the Government Service. The money of the retired person has been swindled by respondent No.2 through cheating. Therefore, the bail of respondent No.2/accused should be canceled.

On the other hand, learned State counsel submits that the police is carrying out the proceedings in the right earnest. Challan has already been filed in this case. Charges have been framed by the Court on 12.12.2017 and the examination of witnesses have been started. Three witnesses have already been examined by the prosecution and the remaining witnesses are

being summoned by the prosecution.

Having heard learned counsel for the parties, this Court does not find any ground to cancel the bail granted to respondent No.2/accused by the trial Court. It is not even the case of the petitioner that the accused has misused the concession of bail granted to him. There is nothing on record, otherwise also, to suggest that the accused is making any attempt to influence the prosecution witnesses, some of whom have already been examined. The only possible reason for filing the present petition seems to be the perceived seriousness of the offence committed by respondent No.2/accused. However, mere seriousness of the offence would not be the proper reason for canceling the bail; which has already been granted by the trial Court after considering the seriousness of the offence, as well as all other attending circumstances.

In view of the above, this Court does not find any ground to interfere in the present petition. Dismissed.

However, the counsel for the petitioner submitted that since the case pertains to the year 2016, therefore, a direction may be issued to the trial Court to conclude the trial in a time bound manner.

Although, it would not be appropriate to time-bound the trial Court, however, in the interest of justice, the trial of the case deserves to be concluded as expeditiously as possible.

(RAJBIR SEHRAWAT)
JUDGE

23.08.2018
Hemlata

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No