

CRM-M No.15091 of 2020
Date of decision:08.07.2020

It has been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner was not named in the FIR and he was named by co-accused in his disclosure statement. It has further been contended that no specific role has been attributed to the petitioner even in the disclosure statement of the co-accused. The counsel for the petitioner would also contend that no recovery has been effected from the petitioner and trial may take a long time to conclude. Learned counsel for the petitioner has also produced on record a

copy of the order dated 25.06.2020 vide which the similarly placed co-accused has been granted bail by the trial Court.

Per contra, it has been contended by learned counsel for the State that it is not a fit case for grant of regular bail. She, however, on instructions from SI Vinod Kumar states that it is infact correct that the petitioner was not named in the FIR but was nominated in the statement of the co-accused. She has also stated that no recovery has been effected from the petitioner.

In view of the above, without commenting anything on the merits of the case, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate, Palwal. It would, however, be open to the prosecution to the get bail cancelled in case the petitioner is found to be misusing the concession of bail.

July 08, 2020
parkash

(ALKA SARIN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/	No
Whether Reportable	Yes/	No