

205

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

**CRM-M-13400-2020 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 18.06.2020**

Ishak Shah

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUDIP AHLUWALIA

Present: Mr. Gourave Bhayyia, Advocate,
for the applicant-petitioner.

Mr. Anant Kataria, DAG, Haryana.

SUDIP AHLUWALIA, J. (ORAL)

CRM-13860-2020

Applicant-petitioner is permitted to place on record the copy of
order dated 16.05.2020 as Annexure A-1.

Application stands disposed off.

CRM-11724-2020

The present application is for exemption from filing the Court
Fee in support of the main Petition.

For the reasons mentioned in the application, the Applicants/
Petitioners are permitted to be exempted from filing the Court Fee at this
stage, subject to the condition that the same must be filed latest by
09.07.2020.

Application stands disposed off.

CRM-M-13400-2020

This is a petition for regular bail under Section 439 Cr.P.C., filed on behalf of the petitioner, who was arrested on 08.04.2020, in case FIR No.0112 dated 08.04.2020, under Sections 148, 149, 188, 269, 270, 323, 332, 353, 354, 506 and 307 of the IPC and Sections 51 and 57 of the Disaster Management Act, 2005 and Section 3 of the Pandemic Disease Act No.3 of 1987, registered at Police Station Sector-14, Panchkula.

[2]. Contends *inter alia* that the petitioner is neither a resident of the concerned area nor was involved in the occurrence. He is stated to have arrived in his in-laws house in Panchkula, from his native place in the District of Rampur, Uttar Pradesh for attending a marriage, but was allegedly picked up by the Police Authorities along with several other local persons.

[3]. To support this contention, Ld. Counsel for the petitioner has relied upon a video clipping ostensibly containing the conversation of Anganwadi worker by the name of Sarita, whose name has been specifically mentioned in the FIR, who is a neighbour of the petitioner's in-laws, and who has in her conversation suggested that the petitioner was possibly not involved in the occurrence.

[4]. Without prejudice to the merit of the submissions raised on behalf of the petitioner, but considering the fact that he has already remained in detention for more than 2 months now and his further detention is not required in the interest of investigation, since the challan has already been submitted against him, this Court is inclined to release the petitioner at this stage, but subject to imposition of heavy and stringent bail condition which are left to the discretion of the Ld. Trial Court/Duty Magistrate,

concerned, considering the fact that the petitioner is otherwise a resident of a different State.

[5]. Disposed off.

18.06.2020

Apurva

**(SUDIP AHLUWALIA)
JUDGE**

1. Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
2. Whether reportable: Yes/No