

**In The High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana  
At Chandigarh**

CRM-M-9284-2020 (O&M)

Date of Decision:- 24.8.2020

Dilshad alias Monu

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL**

Present:- Ms. Sharmila Sharma, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Karan Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

*(the aforesaid presence is being recorded through video conferencing  
since the proceedings are being conducted in Virtual Court)*

\*\*\*\*\*

**GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J. (Oral)**

1. The petitioner has filed this petition seeking grant of regular bail in a case registered against him vide FIR No.461, dated 29.12.2018, Police Station Civil Lines, Sonapat, under Sections 307, 395, 397, 506, 120-B IPC and Section 25/27 of Arms Act.
2. The FIR in question was lodged at the instance of Amit Kumar wherein it has been alleged that on 28.12.2018 he along with his co-employees namely Jagbir, Tejbir and Vikas reached the office of their company after collecting cash from Sonapat. As soon as their vehicle entered the office gate, another car also followed them in which 6 armed persons were sitting, out of which 2 fired shots at him as well

as at his companions and resultantly he was hit on his left arm. However, his companion Monu immediately took the cash box and ran inside the office and locked the same from inside. The said assailants snatched the purse of the complainant containing Rs.3-4 thousand and also snatched Rs.6000/- from co-employee Jagbir and his mobile phone. Although the assailants tried to break open the door of the room where Monu had entered with cash but they could not break upon the same and ultimately left while issuing threats to the complainant.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that he is not named in the FIR and has been falsely roped in on the basis of alleged disclosure statement made by the petitioner himself when he came to be arrested in another case. Learned counsel has further, submitted that since all other co-accused have already been granted bail, the petitioner also deserves the same concession on grounds of parity especially since he has already been behind bars since the last about 1 year and 7 months.
4. Opposing the petition, learned State counsel has submitted that since the petitioner pursuant to his disclosure statement got a pistol recovered, his complicity in the entire occurrence is clearly evident and as such he does not deserve to be released on bail. The learned State counsel has however, informed that the petitioner has been behind bars since the last about 1 year and 7 months and that as on date only 4 out of the cited 27 PWs have been examined and that although complainant Amit Kumar also stands examined but he could

not identify any of the accused as the accused at the time of occurrence were having their faces muffled.

5. I have considered rival submissions addressed before this Court. Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case especially the fact that the petitioner has been behind bars since the last about 1 year and 7 months and that the conclusion of trial is likely to consume more time, further detention of the petitioner will not serve any useful purpose. The petition, as such, is accepted and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned.

**August 24, 2020**  
mohan

**(GURVINDER SINGH GILL)**  
**JUDGE**

Whether speaking /reasoned                      Yes / No

Whether Reportable                                      Yes / No