

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

**CRM-M No.13372 of 2020 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 08.10.2020**

Sanjay Bidlan

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU

Present:- Mr. Ajay Sangroha, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Pardeep Prakash Chahar, DAG, Haryana for the respondent.

MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU, J. (Oral)

Present petition has been filed under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure for grant of interim bail to the petitioner for knee surgery of his father in case FIR No.353 dated 23.07.2019, under Sections 342, 364-A, 506, 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959, registered at Police Station HTM, Hisar, District Hisar.

As per prosecution case, petitioner along with two co-accused abducted the complainant-Rajender Kumar and after receiving the ransom of ₹ 5,55,500/-, released him while threatening not to narrate the incident, otherwise, they will kill his son and wife.

In terms of previous order dated 06.10.2020, learned State Counsel has apprised the Court that since July, 2020, father of the petitioner is residing in H.No.2153, Ekta Nagar, Jind, but as per verbal instructions, his condition is stated to be normal and not bed-ridden, as claimed by the petitioner.

Petitioner is asking for interim bail for knee surgery of his father on the basis of advice dated 07.02.2020, rendered by the Doctor of LNJP Hospital, Kuruksehtra, but after that, no treatment details have been made available on record of the case. Moreover, as per averment made in the petition itself, at the relevant point of time, father of the petitioner was residing in Hisar and he got medical advice from LNJP Hospital, Kurukshetra, therefore, the same seems to be doubtful in the absence of any subsequent treatment.

In view of the above, this Court is not satisfied that prayer of the petitioner is based on genuine cause. Consequently, there is no merit in the present petition seeking interim bail and the same is dismissed.

The above observations may not be construed as an expression of opinion on merits of the case.

However, it is clarified that dismissal of this petition may not be considered as a bar to the petitioner to avail his remedy again for treatment of his father in case the sufficient medical record is made available in this regard.

October 8th, 2020

Gagan

(MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether Reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>