

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

Crl. Misc. No.M-34352 of 2019 (O&M)
Date of Decision:19.09.2019

Ridham Sharma @ Rishu

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present:- Mr. J.S. Mahal, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. APS Gill, DAG, Punjab.
Mr. Vijay Lath, Advocate, for the complainant.

Amol Rattan Singh, J. (Oral)

Learned counsel for the State, as also counsel for the complainant, have appeared today and have produced in Court certain photographs showing a scooter as is alleged to have been burnt by the petitioner, with the learned counsel for the complainant also having produced a print out of what is stated to be a conversation between the sister of the petitioner and the son of the complainant, as also another conversation with a friend of his, which seemingly (prima facie) refer to the factum of the fire having been ignited by the petitioner/at his instance.

That being so, without making any comment on the actual merits of the case, for or against the petitioner, I see no reason to continue with the present petition, which is consequently dismissed, with the interim order vacated.

However, nothing stated herein above would be taken to be an

observation on the merits of the case, which would be gone into by the investigating agency as per the evidence gathered by it and the trial court (if it comes to that stage), on the basis of the evidence led before it.

Further, in the event of the arrest of the petitioner, if he files a petition under Section 439 of the Cr.P.C., that would be considered by the trial court on its own merits, the parameters for grant of bail under Section 438 of the Cr.P.C. and Section 439 of the Cr.P.C. being completely different.

19.09.2019
vcgarg

(Amol Rattan Singh)
Judge

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes
Whether reportable: Yes