

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

226

=====

IN VIRTUAL COURT

=====

CRM-M No. 21651 of 2020 (O & M)
Date of decision : 13.8.2020

Ravish @ Rabba

.....Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJBIR SEHRAWAT

Present : Mr. Jai Singh Yadav, Advocate, for the petitioner

Rajbir Sehrawat, J. (Oral)

CRM No. 18676 of 2020 :

Allowed as prayed for.

Main Case :

This petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 439 of Cr.P.C. for grant of bail pending trial in case FIR No. 90 dated 4.3.2020, registered under Sections 201, 341, 379B, 427 and 506 IPC and Section 25 of Arms Act, 1959, at Police Station Kasola, District Rewari.

It is contended by the counsel for the petitioner that the case against the petitioner is totally concocted. Even as per the allegations of the prosecution, no injury is alleged to have been caused to the complainant. The recovery shown from the petitioner is totally fabricated. The petitioner is in custody since 3.5.2020. It is further submitted that although there are two more cases alleged against the petitioner, however, the allegations in those two cases have been concocted after the petitioner was involved in the present case.

Except these three cases, the petitioner is not involved in any other case whatsoever. The challan has already been filed. The petitioner is not required for any investigation purposes.

Notice of motion.

Mr. Vishal Malik, DAG, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of the State.

The counsel for the State, being instructed by ASI Hawa Singh, has submitted that the name of the petitioner has duly surfaced during the investigation. The recovery of *farsa* and motor cycle have already been effected from the petitioner. The petitioner is involved in two more cases. Therefore, the petitioner does not deserve any concession of bail. However, it is not disputed that there is no injury caused to any person in the incident involved in the present FIR. It is also not disputed that the allegations in other two cases, mentioned against the petitioner, emerged only after the petitioner was involved in the present case. Still further, it is not disputed that the petitioner is in custody since 3.5.2020 and that the challan has already been filed.

In view of the above, but without commenting any further on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed. It is ordered that the petitioner be released on bail pending trial on his furnishing bail bonds/sureties to the satisfaction of the trial Court/ Duty Magistrate.

(RAJBIR SEHRAWAT)
JUDGE

13.8.2020

Ashwani

Speaking/Reasoned	:	Yes/No
Reportable	:	Yes/No