

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

219

**CRM-M-5768-2019
DATE OF DECISION: 14.11.2019**

RAVINDER ALIAS ARVIND

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL

Present: Mr. R.K. Lathwal, Advocate and
Mr. Man Mohit, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Kapil Aggarwal, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL, J. (ORAL)

The petitioner is seeking regular bail in FIR No.605 dated 24.07.2018, under Sections 302, 120-B & 34 IPC and Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959, registered at Police Station City, District Sonipat.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is not named in the FIR wherein two accused have been specifically named and it is also mentioned that there was a third person with them whom the complainant could not recognize. The third person was later on identified as co-accused Sailesh. The petitioner was arraigned as an accused on the supplementary statement of the complainant wherein the petitioner and another were accused of having conspired with the third accused who are either named or referred to in the FIR. No recovery has been effected from the petitioner. There is no motive attributed to the petitioner to enter into conspiracy. He is 23 years of age and not involved in any other case. He is in custody for over 1 year and 3 months.

Learned State counsel, upon instructions from ASI Jagdish, states that 3 out of 23 prosecution witnesses have been examined. Although he is not in a position to controvert the submissions of learned counsel for the petitioner but contends that the petitioner was involved in conspiracy along with the other three accused and is alleged to have taken the deceased to the spot.

Heard.

In view of the submissions of learned counsel for the petitioner, especially when the petitioner is not named in the FIR, he is 23 years of age, he is in custody for over 1 year and 3 months, he is not involved in any other case and the conclusion of the trial is likely to take some time, I deem it a fit case to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

14.11.2019.

SwarnjitS

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