

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-15948-2020

Date of Decision :06.07.2020

Sunil

....Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab

....Respondent

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice B.S. Walia

Present: Mr. Vikas Gulia, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Gaurav Garg Dhuriwala, DAG, Punjab.

B.S. Walia, J. (VC)

1. Case is being taken up for hearing through Video Conferencing due to the outbreak of pandemic Covid-19.

2. Prayer in the petition under Section 439 of Cr.P.C. is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner during the pendency of trial in case FIR No.156 dated 23.03.2020, registered under Sections 307/34 IPC and Sections 25/27/54/59 of the Arms Act, at Police Station Sonapat Sadar, District Sonapat.

3. Learned counsel contends that the petitioner has been implicated in a false case as the only allegation against the petitioner is that he was sitting on the rear seat of the jeep from which Krishan son of Ved Singh, who was sitting on the front seat of the jeep, fired from his pistol towards the salesman, whereupon the bullet hit the bottles on the rack in the liquor vend but no person received injuries and the assailants went away after threatening the salesman with dire consequences.

Learned counsel contends that the gunshot alleged to have been given is

attributed to Krishan and not to the petitioner besides the petitioner was innocent passenger in the rear of the vehicle, no person was injured, challan has been filed on 21.05.2020 and case is now fixed for committal to the Court of Session and considerable period of time will be taken in the conclusion of trial and no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner in custody in view of prevailing corona virus pandemic.

4. Learned Sr. DAG, on instruction from ASI Satyawar, fairly does not controvert the factual position as noted above.

5. In view of the position as noted above, the petition for bail is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing adequate bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned CJM/Trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned provided he is not required in any other case.

6. However, nothing stated hereinabove would be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(B.S. Walia)
Judge

06.07.2020
rajesh/rajneesh

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes / No

Whether Reportable : Yes / No