

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

Sr. No.205

CRM-M-20181-2020

Date of decision: 01.10.2020

Parmeet @ Kala and another

....Petitioners

versus

State of Haryana

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK SIBAL

Present: Mr. Saurabh Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Ashok Kumar Sehrawat, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Sagar Aggarwal, Advocate
for the complainant.

* * *

DEEPAK SIBAL, J. (Oral)

Case taken up through video conferencing.

Through the present petition filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C., the petitioners seek the grant of regular bail in FIR No.543 dated 24.12.2019 registered under Section 379-B IPC (substituted by section 394 IPC later) at Police Station Pundri, District Kaithal.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in the present case; the complainant, who was earlier known to the petitioners has filed an affidavit stating therein that the petitioners were not involved in the offence alleged to have committed; they have been in custody for the last about 7 ½ months; there is no other criminal case in which the petitioners are involved; the report under Section 173 Cr.P.C. has already been filed and therefore the petitioners are not in a position to influence the investigation and that the

trial which is yet to commence would not conclude in the near future.

Learned State counsel, on instructions from SI Bhagirath admits to the fact that the petitioners are not involved in any other criminal case and that report under Section 173 Cr.P.C has been filed. However, the bail is opposed on the ground that the petitioners are involved in a crime which affects the public at large.

After considering the totality of the above facts, this Court is of the opinion that the petitioners be enlarged on bail. Resultantly, subject to the satisfaction of the CJM/Duty Magistrate, Kaithal, the petitioners are directed to be released on bail.

It is clarified that the above observations have been made only for the limited purpose of deciding the present regular bail application and the same would not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(DEEPAK SIBAL)
JUDGE

October 01, 2020

Jyoti 1

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No