

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

CRM-M No.27274 of 2020(O&M)

Date of Decision: 27.10.2020

Sunil @ Sillu

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA

Present: Mr. Sunil Kumar Bhardwaj, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Saurabh Mohunta, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

....

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA.J (ORAL)

Matter has been taken up through Video Conferencing via Webex facility in the light of the Pandemic Covid-19 situation and as per instructions.

Petitioner seeks regular bail pending trial in FIR No.229, dated 27.08.2018 under Sections 201, 341, 342, 394, 397, 452, 120-B of IPC and Sections 25/29-54-59 of Arms Act, registered at Police Station Julana, District Jind.

Counsel for the parties have been heard.

FIR came to be registered on the statement of Vijay Yadav who was serving on the post of clerk in the main branch of the Punjab National Bank, District Jind. Occurrence is of 27.08.2018. As per prosecution version, at about 12 noon, three young boys wearing helmet and holding fire arms entered the main gate of the Bank and committed a robbery of a sum of Rs.82,405/-.

Counsel has argued that name of the petitioner does not figure in the FIR. There is no incriminating evidence against him. Rather, he was

arrested in a different matter and it is on its own confessional statement that he is sought to be implicated in the present case. Further, urged that petitioner has been shown in custody in the present case since 05.12.2018 and since the trial is not making any substantial progress, he deserves to be released on bail.

There is a CCTV footage of the occurrence. That apart Rs.20,000/- currency notes have been recovered from the petitioner. It may be taken note of that, the currency notes that had been looted from the Bank were numbered and the record of which was kept by the Bank. The recovered currency notes and the numbers thereupon, match the looted amount.

Petitioner furthermore does not possess clean antecedents inasmuch as he is involved in two other FIRs i.e FIR No.288, dated 21.09.2018 Under Sections 392, 395, 397, 120-B of IPC and Sections 25, 54, 59 of the Arms Act, registered at Police Station Narnaund and FIR No.295 dated 28.09.2018 under Sections 398 and 401 of IPC and Sections 25, 54, 59 of the Arms Act , registered at the same very police station.

It goes without saying that in such matters, the petitioner, if granted benefit of bail, there would be a distinct possibility that he may resort to intimidating and threatening the witnesses.

For the reasons recorded above and in the light of the seriousness of the offence, this Court is not inclined to accept the prayer made in this petition for grant of bail.

Petition accordingly is dismissed.

However, keeping in view the length of incarceration already suffered by the petitioner while declining the prayer of bail, trial Court is directed to make an earnest endeavour to conclude the trial, expeditiously.

(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE

October 27, 2020
hemlata

- | | | |
|-----|----------------------------|--------|
| i) | Whether speaking/reasoned? | Yes/No |
| ii) | Whether reportable? | Yes/No |