

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

226)

Crl. Misc. No.M-38851 of 2019(O&M)
Date of Decision: 17.09.2019

Pinta @ Bholla

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present:- Mr. Raghav Kapoor, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. Neeraj Poswal, AAG, Haryana.

Amol Rattan Singh, J. (Oral)

By this petition, filed under the provisions of Section 439 of the Cr.P.C., the petitioner seeks the concession of 'regular bail'.

Though the learned counsel for the petitioner has vehemently argued that the complainant turned hostile *qua* identifying one of the co-accused at the time of his testimony, but is stated to have identified the petitioner, with there being contradictions in the version recorded in the FIR and the subsequent version given by the complainant even as regards the make of the car, the fact remains that the petitioner is stated to have been identified by the complainant during his testimony before the trial court, with a mobile phone also stated to have been recovered from the petitioner.

Consequently, without making any comment on the merits of the case, for or against the petitioner, which would be naturally gone into by the learned trial court on the basis of the evidence led before it, as regards

the concession of granting of bail, in my opinion, he is not entitled to such concession.

Dismissed.

17.09.2019

vcgarg

(Amol Rattan Singh)

Judge

Whether reasoned/speaking: Yes

Whether reportable: no