

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

\*\*\*\*

**CRM-M-15835-2020 (O&M)**

**Date of Decision: 03.07.2020**

\*\*\*\*

Rajpal @ Raju

... Petitioner

VS.

State of Haryana

... Respondent

\*\*\*\*

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE GIRISH AGNIHOTRI**

\*\*\*\*

Present: Mr. Nipun Vashist, Advocate for the petitioner

Mr. Sukhdeep Parmar, DAG, Haryana

\*\*\*\*

**GIRISH AGNIHOTRI, J. (Oral)**

The matter has been taken up through video conferencing on account of lockdown due to outbreak of COVID-19 pandemic.

The petitioner Rajpal @ Raju who is stated to be aged 30 years has filed the present petition *inter alia* with a prayer for grant of regular bail. He has been allegedly involved in case FIR No.371 dated 12.11.2019 under Sections 379-B/34 IPC and Section 25 of the Arms Act registered at PS Khol, District Rewari.

At the outset, learned counsel for the petitioner makes an oral request that Section 420/411 IPC were subsequently added. In view of the present peculiar circumstances, he prays that the Registry may be directed to carry out necessary correction/amendment in the heading as well as in the prayer clause of the petition. So ordered.

Learned counsel based upon the pleadings submits that the FIR was initially lodged against the unknown persons. It is a case where there is no allegation of any injury caused. He further submits that in any case, the petitioner is not the main accused as per the prosecution. Counsel submits that the petitioner was arrested on 14.11.2019 and challan in this case has

been presented on 06.02.2020 and since then, no substantial progress has taken place because of the present COVID-19 situation.

Notice of motion.

On the asking, Mr. Sukhdeep Parmar, DAG, Haryana accepts notice through video conferencing.

Learned State counsel, however, on the other hand, submits that the petitioner was identified and an amount of Rs.19,800/- was allegedly snatched by the petitioner.

Faced with this, counsel then submits that due to COVID situation retention of the petitioner in jail is dangerous to his life and otherwise also the trial is likely to take some time.

In view of the above, this Court deems it appropriate to release the petitioner on regular bail subject to his furnishing adequate bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Duty Magistrate/trial court concerned.

In view of the peculiar circumstances as noticed above, in addition to bail bonds/additional surety which the trial court may further require the petitioner to furnish as it deems appropriate, the petitioner is directed to furnish FDR of Rs.20,000/- in his name valid for two years before the Duty Magistrate/trial Court which shall await further orders of this Court.

However, it is made clear that anything observed herein shall not be construed to be an expression on merits of the case.

Disposed of.

**03.07.2020**

*vishal shonkar*

**(Girish Agnihotri)**  
**Judge**

1. *Whether speaking/reasoned?*
2. *Whether reportable?*

*Yes/No*  
*Yes/No*