

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

CRM-M-13626-2020 (O&M)

Date of decision: - 29.06.2020

Parveen

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Sanjeev Majra, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Manish Bansal, DAG, Haryana.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

Case is taken up for hearing through video conferencing.

Petitioner has filed this petition under Section 439 of Cr.P.C. for grant of regular bail in case FIR No. 67 dated 19.02.2016 registered under Sections 395, 397 IPC and Section 25 of Arms Act (deleted later on) at Police Station Sadar Panipat, District Panipat.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that the alleged FIR was registered on the statement of Manjeet Jaglan-complainant. No role has been attributed to the petitioner and he has been in custody since 05.05.2017 even there was no evidence against him. Co-accused Baru @ Satish @ Kala, Sanjay and Rohit have been granted bail, vide orders dated 03.03.2020 and 19.05.2020 respectively (Annexure P-3 and P-4). He prays for regular bail of the petitioner on parity with co-accused Rohit.

Learned State counsel has not disputed the fact regarding the custody period of the petitioner and further states that out of 34 prosecution witnesses, 9 prosecution witnesses have been examined.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

The petitioner has been in custody since 05.05.2017 and co-accused have been granted bail, the trial will take time to conclude and no useful purpose would be served by detaining the petitioner behind the bars.

In view of the above, without commenting anything on the merits, lest it should prejudice the case of either side, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

29.06.2020
Mangal Singh

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