

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND
HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M- 13464-2020 (O&M)

Date of Decision: June 12, 2020

Baljeet

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JAISHREE THAKUR

Present:- Mr. Pawan Kumar Hooda, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Dimple Jain, DAG, Haryana.

JAISHREE THAKUR, J. (Oral)

The instant petition has been filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C. for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 311 dated 18.09.2019, under Sections 307, 323, 34, 354, 406, 498-A Indian Penal Code, registered at Police Station Murthal, District Sonipat.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner herein was taken into custody in the aforesaid FIR on 04.10.2019. It is submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is also contended that the allegations as set out in the FIR are not sustainable as the petitioner is residing separately while further arguing that the challan has been presented in the matter and no recoveries are to be effected from the petitioner and that the conclusion of trial will take time as

the Courts are not fully functional, therefore, the petitioner is entitled to be enlarged on bail.

Per contra, learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent-State, on telephone instructions from the Investigating Officer-ASI Rajbir, opposes the grant of regular bail to the petitioner, while submitting that offences alleged against the petitioner are serious in nature, however, she does not dispute the fact that the challan has been presented and that the trial is likely to take some time as two sons of the petitioner, who are also named in the FIR, have not been arrested.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties.

Since in view of the restricted working of the Courts due to pandemic COVID-19 situation, the trial is likely to take some time and in view of the facts that the petitioner herein has been in custody since 04.12.19 and that the challan has been presented in the matter and that the trial is likely to take some time as two sons of the petitioner named in the FIR have not been arrested, no useful purpose would be served in keeping the petitioner behind bars. At this stage, without commenting on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is directed to be released on regular bail on execution of adequate personal bond and surety bond to the satisfaction of concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

June 12, 2020
seema

(JAISHREE THAKUR)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes
Yes/No