

206

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

CRM-M No. 19341 of 2020
Date of Decision: 09.10.2020

Vikas

-Petitioner

Vs

State of Haryana

-Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH

Present: Mr. Shashi Kant Gupta, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajat Gautam, D.A.G., Haryana.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J. (ORAL)

The case has been taken up for hearing through video-conferencing.

Petitioner seeks grant of regular bail under Section 439 Cr.P.C. in case bearing FIR No.59 dated 01.05.2018 under Sections 148, 149, 323, 427, 506 IPC registered at Police Station Satnali, District Mahendergarh.

Petitioner was granted regular bail by the trial Court, but on account of his absence on 22.10.2019, his bail was cancelled on 22.10.2019.

At the time of his absence, the case was fixed for prosecution evidence.

Petitioner was arrested on 17.12.2019 in some other case. He was arrested on production warrants in the present case on 23.03.2020 and since then, he is in custody.

Due to lockdown and the situation arising out of pandemic COVID-19, the trial did not make any progress since the date of re-arrest of the petitioner in the present case.

Learned State counsel on instructions from SI Alok Kumar submits that the petitioner has antecedent behaviour of criminal activity as he is involved in 17 other cases also. In three cases, he has been acquitted. In one case, he has been convicted. Other cases are at the stage of trial.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is on bail in all the cases except the present one.

The petitioner was granted regular bail in this case by the trial Court and his bail was cancelled on 22.10.2019 on account of his absence. Now since 23.03.2020, he is in custody.

In view of aforesaid position, it would be just and appropriate to enlarge the petitioner on regular bail.

In view of above, the petition is allowed. Petitioner is directed to be released on regular bail, subject to his furnishing heavy bail bonds and local surety to the satisfaction of trial Court/concerned Duty Magistrate.

Nothing expressed hereinabove would be construed to be an opinion on the merits of the case.

09.10.2020
Jyoti Sharma

(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE

1. Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
2. Whether reportable : Yes/No