

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

(I) CRM-M-13877-2020
RAVI VERMAPetitioner
Versus
U.T. CHANDIGARHRespondent

(II) CRM-M-11545-2020
VIKRAM @ VICKYPetitioner
Versus
STATE OF U.T CHANDIGARH
....Respondent

Date of Decision:9.9.2020

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present: Mr. Durga Dutt Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-13877-2020.

Mr. Sunil K. Chindaliya, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-11545-2020.

Mr. Gagandeep Singh Wasu, Addl. P.P., U.T. Chandigarh.

(Proceedings conducted through video conferencing).

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

1. This order shall dispose of the aforementioned petitions filed on behalf of Ravi Verma and Vikram @ Vicky seeking regular bail in respect of a case registered against them vide FIR No.187 dated 22.10.2019 under Sections

365, 307, 342, 506, 147, 148, 149 of IPC & Section 25 Arms Act, at Police Sation Mauli Jagran, Chandigarh.

2. The FIR in question was lodged at the instance of Rajat wherein it has been alleged that on 21.10.2019 he had gone to meet his uncle at Mauli Jagran Complex. At about 10.30 pm. when he was returning back to his home at Maloya, he met Constable Ajay and at that time some boys of Rajiv Colony, Panchkula, namely Labbal and Vikcy accompanied by 2-3 of their friends came there and started hurling abuses while stating that the complainant was an agent of the police and had come there for the purpose of spying. Ajay reasoned out with them and thereafter left in his car. However, Labbal and his companions kidnapped the complainant and gave beatings to him and took him to a room in Rajiv Colony, Panchkula, where they gave kick blows and punches to him and also gave beatings to him with a stick. The complainant was tied with a rope and the accused initially left the room but came back and at that time he saw that Labbal was carrying a country made pistol and he loaded the said pistol and pointed the same towards the mouth of the complainant and pressed the trigger but luckily the pistol did not fire and thereafter the accused again gave beatings to him and kept him confined there and later left after locking the room from outside.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner-Ravi Verma has submitted that he is nowhere named in the FIR and has been nominated as an accused subsequently on the basis of alleged disclosure statements made by Inderjeet Singh and Vikram.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner-Vikram @ Vicky has submitted that he has has falsely been implicated in the present case and that it is the co-accused Labbal who is alleged to have fired from a pistol although it misfired and no shot was fired.
5. Learned counsel for the petitioners further submitted that the petitioners in any case have been behind bars since last more than 8 months and that one of the co-accused namely Inderjeet has already been granted regular bail.
6. Opposing the petitions, learned State counsel has submitted that the petitioners cannot claim parity with the co-accused Inderjeet inasmuch as he was granted bail mainly on the ground that he was of tender age. Learned State counsel has further submitted while Vikram @ Vicky is not involved in any case, there are several other cases pending against Ravi Verma and who also happens to be convicted in four cases. Learned State counsel has however, informed that the petitioners have indeed been behind bars since last more than 8 months.
7. I have considered rival submissions addressed before this Court.
8. Keeping in view the fact that the petitioner-Ravi Verma is stated to be nominated as an accused on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused, the admissibility and veracity of which would be debatable and the fact that the co-accused Vikram @ Vicky is not stated to be involved in any other case and also that the petitioners has been behind bars since last more than 8 months, further detention of the petitioners will not serve any useful purpose as conclusion of trial is likely to consume some time.

(4)

CRM-M-13877-2020
CRM-M-11545-2020

The petitions, as such, are accepted and the petitioners are ordered to be released on regular bail on their furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned.

9.9.2020
Gaurav Sorot

(GURVINDER SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned / speaking? **Yes / No**

Whether reportable? **Yes / No**