

HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-16739-2020 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 14.07.2020

Parveen @ Kalu

... Petitioner

VS.

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE GIRISH AGNIHOTRI

Present: Mr. Manoj Kumar Sood, Advocate for the petitioner

Mr. Amit Aggarwal, 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 Parveen @ Kalu stated to be aged 21 years, has filed the present petition *inter alia* with a prayer for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.276 dated 19.11.2019 under Sections 307/34/341/506 IPC and Sections 25/54/59 of Arms Act, registered at PS Tigaon, Faridabad.

Learned counsel based upon the pleadings in the petition submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the FIR. He is not named in the FIR. The FIR was got registered at the instance of Avatar alleging that Naresh, Sudhir and others had shot at his brother and gave beating with rod. It was specifically alleged that Naresh had fired a shot at Sunder which had hit at his leg and alleged that others gave him beating with rod. On the asking, learned counsel for the petitioner further mentions that the petitioner was later named in the case by one of the co-accused. He has been arrested on 06.12.2019.

Notice of motion.

On the asking, Mr. Amit Aggarwal, DAG Haryana accepts notice on behalf of the respondent through video conferencing.

Learned State counsel submits that challan in the present case has been presented in May 2020; there are a total of 17 witnesses out of which none have been examined and charges are yet to be framed.

Faced with this, counsel for the petitioner submits that co-accused Vikas has been granted regular bail by the trial court vide order dated 04.07.2020. He 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.

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

Disposed of.

14.07.2020

vishal shonkar

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

(Girish Agnihotri)
Judge

Yes/No
Yes/No