

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

**CRM-M-27316-2020 (O&M)**

**Date of decision: 17.09.2020**

Manoj

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL**

Present:- Mr. Vikas Gulia, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Ramesh Kumar Ambavta, AAG Haryana

\*\*\*\*

**HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)**

Case is taken up for hearing through video conferencing.

The petitioner has filed this petition under Section 439 of Cr.P.C. for grant of regular bail in case FIR No. 484 dated 28.10.2016 registered under Sections 307 and 34 IPC (Section 120-B IPC added later on) and Section 25 of Arms Act, 1959, at Police Station Gannaur, District Sonapat.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that the petitioner was granted regular bail by the learned trial Court vide order dated 26.02.2018, but he could not appear before the learned trial Court on 12.04.2019, on account of enmity with some persons, he was apprehending danger to his life

and liberty. However, the learned trial Court cancelled his bail pursuant whereeto, he was taken into custody and as such he has been in custody since 16.09.2019. He further states that all the co-accused have been granted bail.

Learned State counsel, On the instructions from ASI Satish, points out that out of 25 prosecution witnesses, no witness has been examined so far and that during the petitioner's absconding period, as many as 4 other FIRs have been registered against him.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

Indisputably, the petitioner jumped the bail granted by the learned trial Court. Assuming the ground for his non-appearance before the learned trial Court on 12.04.2019 to be correct, even then the fact remains that during his period of absconding, 4 other cases have been registered against the petitioner. There is no denial to the said fact from the petitioner's side. This fact is sufficient enough to decline the prayer made in the present petition as the petitioner being habitual offender is not entitled to the concession of regular bail. Moreover, enlarging the petitioner on bail would be a threat to the security of the society at large as keeping in view his criminal antecedents, he might involve himself in many more criminal activities.

Present petition is dismissed accordingly.

**(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)**  
**JUDGE**

**17.09.2020**  
*Mangal Singh*

Whether reasoned/speaking?  
Whether reportable?

Yes/No  
Yes/No