

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

**CRM-M-410-2019**

**Date of decision:17.01.2019**

Kaptan

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

\*\*\*\*

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL**

\*\*\*\*

Present: Mr. Arjun Lakhanpal, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Ms. Aditi Girdhar, AAG, Haryana.

\*\*\*\*

**GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)**

1. The petitioner seeks grant of regular bail in case registered vide FIR No.220 dated 28.9.2017 under Sections 364, 302, 201 and 120-B of Indian Penal Code, 1860 and Section 25 of Arms Act, Police Station Quilla Panipat, District Panipat.
- 2 The FIR was registered at the instance of Vinod, wherein it has been alleged that on 24.9.2017 his son Monu received a call from some boy asking him to come to Uttar Pradesh (U.P.) on 25.9.2017 his son informed that he is leaving for village Diddu Khera (U.P.) i.e. his maternal uncle's village but he did not reach there. On 27.9.2017 his

son called his '*Mausi*' (aunt) Suman telephonically and informed her that he had been kidnapped by son-in-law of Phool Hassan. The complainant has alleged that he suspects that his son had been kidnapped by Phool Hassan, his brothers Shada, Mahenda and Kaptan (petitioner). It is further the case of prosecution that subsequently i.e. on 10.10.2017, the complainant made a supplementary statement, wherein he alleged that his son Monu had enticed away Sonia, daughter of Phool Hassan, because of which Phool Hassan and his family nursed a grudge against his son and that he suspects that due to the said grudge Mehendi Hassan, Dilshad, Kaptan (petitioner), Islam, Sinha and Intzar had conspired and has got his son killed though through Azad and Wazid.

3. It is further the case of prosecution that aforesaid Azad was arrested and upon his disclosure statement, the dead-body of Monu was recovered and he admitted that he alongwith Wazid had killed Monu.
4. The learned counsel for the petitioner have submitted that the present case is a case of blind murder and that the petitioner has been involved merely on the basis of suspicion.
5. On the other hand, the learned State counsel assisted by the learned counsel for the complainant has submitted that since Azad, who had initially been arrested and had made a disclosure statement leading to recovery of dead-body of Monu and who had also named the present petitioner, the complicity of the petitioner is evident and no case for grant of bail is made out.

6. Having considered rival submissions addressed before this Court and bearing in mind the fact that the present case is based totally on circumstantial evidence and also that the petitioner has been behind bars since the last more than 15 months and that conclusion of trial is likely to take some time, in my opinion, no useful purpose will be served by detaining the petitioner behind bars any further. The petition, as such, is accepted. The petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on their furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned.
7. It is, however, clarified that none of the observations made above shall be taken to be an expression on merits of the main case.

**17.01.2019**

Gaurav Sorot

**( GURVINDER SINGH GILL )  
JUDGE**Whether reasoned / speaking? **Yes / No**Whether reportable? **Yes / No**