

HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-19817-2020 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 07.08.2020

Talim

... Petitioner

VS.

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE GIRISH AGNIHOTRI

Present: Mr. Gautam Dutt, Advocate for the petitioner

Mr. Rajiv Goel, 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 Talim who is stated to be aged 34 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.0012 dated 20.01.2020 under Sections 341/364/379-B/34 IPC and Section 25 of the Arms Act (challan presented under Sections 341/365/395/397/34 IPC and Section 27(1), 54-59 of the Arms Act, 1959), registered at PS Bhondsi, District Gurugram.

Learned counsel submits that the only role attributed to the petitioner is that the phone which was used by the co-accused Saikul was allegedly given by the petitioner. He goes on to submit that when Shokeen was arrested on 02.02.2020 even in his disclosure statement, the allegation against the petitioner is not to the effect that the petitioner was present at the time of occurrence.

Learned State counsel submits that the challan in this case has been presented on 29.04.2020. There are a total of 17 witnesses but none

have been examined till date. It is further submitted that there are more than one FIR against him.

Faced with this learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he is on bail in one of the FIR. He further submits that the petitioner was arrested in a case by Delhi Police and on an alleged disclosure that the petitioner was arrested in the present case. He further submits that the petitioner is a young man of 34 years of age. He was arrested on 03.03.2020. 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.

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

Disposed of.

07.08.2020

vishal shonkar

**(Girish Agnihotri)
Judge**

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

Yes/No
Yes/No