

230

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-26277 OF 2019
Date of Decision: 21.11.2019

Sunder LalPetitioner

versus

State of HaryanaRespondent

CORAM HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL

Present Mr.L.M.Gulati, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. Saurabh Girdhar, AAG, Haryana.

ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL, J (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking regular bail in FIR No.1417 dated 17.10.2015 under Sections 392, 395, 397, 120-B IPC, 1860 and Sections 25/54 of the Arms Act, 1959, registered at Police Station City Panipat, District Panipat.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that allegations against the petitioner are that he and four other co-accused had snatched the car and purse of the complainant. The petitioner had earlier been granted regular bail by the trial Court but as he was arrested in a case under the Excise Act, he could not appear before the trial Court and therefore, his bail bonds were cancelled. He is in custody for over 7 months after his re-arrest. The other four similarly situate co-accused have been acquitted at the conclusion of the trial as the prosecution case has been disbelieved.

Learned State counsel, upon instructions from ASI Ram Niwas, states that charges have been framed and none of the 18 prosecution witnesses has been examined.

Heard.

In view of the submissions of learned counsel for the petitioner, especially when he is in custody for over 7 months; similarly situated co-accused have already been acquitted 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.

21.11.2019
mamta

(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

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