

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

**CRM-M No. 11037 of 2019
Date of Decision:-20.03.2019**

Sanoj @ Sanjot Kumar

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present:- Mr. Aditya Sanghi, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sukhdeep Parmar, DAG, Haryana.

MANOJ BAJAJ J.(Oral)

Petitioner Sanoj @ Sanjot Kumar is praying for grant of regular bail under Section 439 Cr.P.C. in case FIR No.159 dated 23.2.2019, under Sections 323, 342, 384, 34 IPC and Section 83 of the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015, registered at Police Station Karnal Civil Lines, District Karnal. The petitioner is in custody since his arrest on 24.2.2019.

The FIR was registered on the basis of statement given by complainant Parveen Bajaj, wherein it was alleged that on 23.2.2019 a call

was received from mobile No.99961-34433 informing the complainant that his son, namely, Dhruv Bajaj is with the caller, who was in debt of Rs.32,000/- on account of loss suffered in cricket betting. It was further informed that his iphone and a cheque was also with the caller. The complainant, thereafter, talked to his son, who further informed that two months back petitioner Sanoj @ Sanjot Kumar introduced him to one Monu, who was engaged in this activity of cricket betting.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the only allegation against the petitioner is that he introduced the son of the complainant to Monu. According to him, it was a voluntary decision of Dhruv Bajaj to enter into cricket betting and the alleged offence as narrated by the complainant was committed by main accused Monu and one another person, namely, Amit Punia, from whose phone the alleged call was made to the complainant.

On the other hand, the bail application is opposed by learned State counsel, who is assisted by ASI Jai Naraian. It is pointed out that the main accused Monu is in custody whereas other person, namely, Amit Punia is yet to be arrested. It is not in dispute that the only allegation against the petitioner is that he had introduced Dhruv Bajaj to the main accused Monu. It is also not disputed that the petitioner is in judicial custody and no more required for investigation, which is almost complete.

Considering the above background, the custody of the petitioner and the fact that he is no more required for further custodial investigation, his further detention may not be justified. Resultantly,

without expressing anything on merits of the case, it is ordered that the petitioner be released on regular bail subject to his furnishing the requisite bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

The petition is allowed.

March 20, 2019
Vijay Asija

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes / No
Yes / No