

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

(i) CRM No.M-17916 of 2019 (O&M)

Jyoti Parshad

...Petitioner

VERSUS

U.T. of Chandigarh

...Respondent

(ii) CRM No.M-18449 of 2019 (O&M)

Deepak

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of U.T. Chandigarh

...Respondent

(iii) CRM No.M-18765 of 2019 (O&M)

Anil

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of U.T. Chandigarh

...Respondent

Date of Decision: July 02, 2019

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

Present: Mr.Kulwinder Singh, Advocate for
Mr.S.S.Sarwara, Advocate
for the petitioner (in CRM No.M-17916 of 2019).

Mr.Robin Singh Hooda, Advocate
for the petitioner (in CRM No.M-18449 of 2019).

Mr.S.K.Verma, Advocate
for the petitioner (in CRM No.M-18765 of 2019).

Mr.Lalit K. Gupta, Addl. Public Prosecutor
for the respondent-U.T. Chandigarh.

INDERJIT SINGH, J.

All the above-mentioned cases are taken up together as these have arisen from same FIR.

Petitioners have filed these petitions under Section 439 Cr.P.C. for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.120 dated 30.04.2018 under Sections 147, 148, 149, 325, 307, 302 IPC and Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act, registered at Police Station Mauli Jagran, Chandigarh.

Notice of motion were issued. Learned Addl. Public Prosecutor for U.T. Chandigarh appeared, contested the petitions and also filed the reply in each case.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioners as well as learned Addl. Public Prosecutor for U.T. Chandigarh and have gone through the record.

The perusal of the record shows that FIR was registered in this case on the statement of Ravi Kumar, who stated that he along with Sachin, Vikas and Rajat, was present when the occurrence took place and names of accused have been mentioned as Smack, Tony, Sultan etc.

Learned counsel for the petitioners have placed on record statements of PW-1 Ravi Kumar, PW-2 Sachin and PW-3 Rajat, complainant and eye witnesses to the occurrence, who have specifically deposed in the Court that accused present in the Court are not the persons who caused injuries and death of Vikas. Learned counsel for the petitioners

argued that material witnesses in this case have not supported the

prosecution version.

The petitioners have been in custody for the last more than one year. They are not required for any investigation or interrogation purposes as they are in judicial custody. The trial of the case will take long time. No useful purpose will be served by keeping the petitioners in custody till the disposal of the case.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, without discussing the facts in minute detail and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, all the petitions are allowed and the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail subject to their furnishing personal/surety bonds in the sum of ₹50,000/- with one surety in the like amount each to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

July 02, 2019
Vgulati

(INDERJIT SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether reportable	No