

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

Crl. Misc. No.M-45220 of 2019(O&M)
Date of Decision: 18.12.2019

Tarsem

.....Petitioner

Versus

Union Territory, Chandigarh

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present:- Mr. Vivek Kathuria, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Gautam Kaile, Advocate, for
Mr. Rajiv Sharma, Addl. P.P., U.T., Chanadigarh.

Mr. Palvinder Singh, Advocate,
for the complainant.

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 learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
the petitioner had been acquitted in most of the cases registered
against him, however, learned counsel appearing for the U.T.
Chandigarh, and learned counsel appearing for the mother of the
deceased, submit that the petitioner, firstly, is a habitual offender,
with learned counsel for the mother of the deceased (taken for
practical purposes to be the complainant, the complainant having

because he, having been arrested in connection with some other criminal case registered, was under pressure from the petitioner and the others lodged in the jail, to not testify against them (as contended before this Court).

He further submits that the mother of the deceased though earlier was given up as a witness, however, now is being sought to be recalled as a witness, she also being (again as contended) a witness to her late son's statement to the effect that it was the petitioner who had attacked him.

Consequently, without making any comment on the actual merits of the case, for or against the petitioner, in the aforesaid circumstances, I do not consider it appropriate to admit the petitioner to bail at this stage at least.

Dismissed.

18.12.2019

Satyawan

(Amol Rattan Singh)
Judge

Whether reasoned/speaking: Yes

Whether reportable: no