

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

Sr. No.210

CRM-M-8341-2019

DECIDED ON: March 05, 2019

SANJEEV KUMAR @ MINTA GUJJAR

...PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

...RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR MITTAL

Present: Mr. Sanjeev Duggal, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Luvinder Sofat, AAG, Punjab.

SUDHIR MITTAL, J. (ORAL)

The petitioner seeks grant of regular bail in case FIR No. 164 dated 22.12.2016 initially registered under Sections 323, 324, 307, 379-B IPC but the challan was presented under Sections 307, 326, 325, 324, 323, 394, 148, 149 IPC, at Police Station Sadar Hoshiarpur, District Hoshiarpur.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been in custody since 10.11.2017. The trial is not likely to be concluded at an early date as examination of PWs has not yet started. The main accused namely Harish Kumar has been granted regular bail and thus, the petitioner also deserve the same concession.

Learned State counsel submits that there are 11 other criminal cases pending against the petitioner out of these 11 cases, 03 cases are under Section 307 IPC, 02 are under Section 379-B/399 IPC. Thus, the petitioner is a hardened criminal and he is not entitled to equate himself with co-accused Harish Kumar. The present FIR was also registered against the petitioner because he wanted the complainant to depose in his favour in the pending criminal cases.

CRM-M-8341-2019

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that out of 11 pending cases, the petitioner has been granted regular bail in 09 cases. He is desirous of joining the mainstream of society and thus, he must be permitted to reform himself.

A person who is accused of heinous offences in five other criminal cases, cannot seek sympathetic consideration at the hands of the Court. The antecedents of such a person speak against him and the contention raised on his behalf that he is wanting to reform himself, can only be treated with a pinch of salt. Releasing such a person can only result in creating a threat to the society at large and thus, such a person does not deserve to be granted regular bail. If the petitioner actually intends to reform himself he has to remain in custody and has to undergo various sentences that may be imposed upon him rather than to approach the Court for grant of bail.

The petition has no merit and is accordingly dismissed.

March 05, 2019

Ankur

**(SUDHIR MITTAL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether Reportable

Yes/No