

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.13141 of 2020
Date of Decision :09.06.2020

Mandeep Singh @ Lavi

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE ARUN PALLI, JUDGE

Present : Mr.G.C.Shahpuri, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Munish Sharma, AAG, Haryana.
(The aforesaid presence is being recorded through video conferencing
since the proceedings are being conducted in virtual Court)

ARUN PALLI, J. (Oral):

CRM-11467-2020

Allowed as prayed for subject to all just exceptions.

CRM-M No.13141 of 2020

The petitioner prays for a regular bail pending trial under Section 439 of Cr.P.C in FIR No.175 dated 19.06.2019, under Sections 307, 450 of IPC and 25/54/59 of Arms Act, registered at Police Station Chhappar, District Yamuna Nagar, whereas Section 27 of Arms Act was added subsequently.

As per the prosecution version on 18.06.2019, while Lalit Singh, SHO, Police Station Chhappar, along with other police officials was on a patrol duty near village Sudail, he received a telephonic message from the village sarpanch that Parveen Kaur (complainant) wife of Satnam Singh has been shot by some one and her family members have rushed her to the hospital. Statement of her son namely Virender Singh was recorded on the same day. He revealed that at about 9.30 P.M, while he was playing in a verandah, her mother after finishing her meals went towards the wash room to wash her hands. After washing her

hands as she was going towards her room one person aged 25 to 30, years who was carrying a gun, started firing upon her, as a result she suffered a gun shot injury on her head and arms. Whereafter the said person fled from the spot.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that neither the petitioner is named in the FIR nor any injury is attributed to him. In fact, he submits that petitioner was implicated on the disclosure statement of the main accused Gurdit Singh @ Badal, which too was recorded 6 months after the occurrence on 10.12.2019. Therefore, he asserts that implication of the petitioner is apparently false. Further, nothing is recovered from the petitioner and he is in custody since 12.12.2019.

The factual position as sketched out above is not disputed by learned State counsel.

In the wake of the above, it would be just and appropriate to release the petitioner on regular bail.

Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be enlarged on bail subject to his furnishing adequate bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of trial Court/ Duty Magistrate, Yamuna Nagar at Jagadhri.

Needless to assert that this order as also the observation made hereinabove shall not constitute any expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(ARUN PALLI)
JUDGE

09.06.2020

Manoj Bhutani

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No