

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-24749-2019

Date of Decision: 19.10.2019

Vijay Kumar

.....Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present: Mr. Anter Singh Brar, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Poswal, A.A.G., Haryana.

Mr. Sachin Rai Vaid, Advocate,
for the complainant.

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J. (ORAL)

Mr. Brar, learned counsel for the petitioner, has vehemently argued that the petitioner only having been named in a disclosure statement made by one of the co-accused of the petitioner, and he having been in custody for the past more than one year, he deserves the concession of bail.

He further submits that he is only named as one of the conspirators in the occurrence, with the allegation against him only being that he is guilty of an offence punishable under Section 120-B of the IPC.

Learned counsel for the State, as also for the complainant, however both submit that the petitioner has actually been named by the eye witness, Rambir, to be the person who informed the other accused of the fact that the deceased (named Session Judge) had left his home, with the said Rambir also having stated in his examination in chief that the petitioner was standing with a

mobile phone in his hand outside at the time when the deceased left his home.

Learned counsel for the complainant has further submitted that as a matter of fact even the said Rambir has been attacked twice, with on one occasion the security personnel assigned to him injured, and on one occasion the security personnel, i.e. ASI Suresh Kumar, having been unfortunately killed.

Keeping in view the above, without making any comment on the actual merits of the case for or against the petitioner, I do not consider it an appropriate case where the petitioner can be admitted to bail.

Dismissed, at this stage.

October 19, 2019
nitin/dinesh

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes
No.