

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA, CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-35360 of 2020

Date of decision : November 9, 2020

Piyush Piplani

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL**

Present:- Ms. Mayuri Lakhanpal, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Apoorv Garg, DAG., Haryana.

\*\*\*

**Manjari Nehru Kaul, J (oral).**

The present petition has been filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, in case FIR No. 178 dated 26.5.2019 under Sections 307, 34, 506 IPC and Sections 25, 54, 59 of Arms Act and Section 3 of The Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 registered at Police Station Pinjore District Panchkula.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the case in hand and the only role attributed to the petitioner is that he fired from the fire arm which he was carrying on his person at the time of the alleged occurrence. She further submits that the petitioner has been in custody since 1.8.2019 and the trial is not likely to conclude in the near future. Moreover, subsequent to the registration of the instant FIR, the matter has been compromised between the parties vide compromise dated 22.1.2020 (Annexure P-3).

Per contra, learned State counsel while opposing the grant of

regular bail to the petitioner on instructions from ASI Suresh Kumar has submitted that the prosecution evidence is under way and as many as three prosecution witnesses out of 25 prosecution witnesses cited so far have been examined and hence the trial would not take much time to conclude. He has further apprised the Court that as per the FSL report, the used cartridge which was recovered from the alleged place of occurrence matched with the one used by the petitioner. He has also submitted that the petitioner is a man of criminal antecedents which is evident from the fact that there are as many as three other criminal cases registered against him.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material on record. The petitioner does not deserve the concession of regular bail. The instant petition stands dismissed.

Since the petitioner has been in custody for more than a year the trial court shall endeavour to expedite the trial and conclude it as expeditiously as possible.

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

**(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)**  
**JUDGE**

**November 9, 2020**  
**archana**

**Whether speaking/reasoned**  
**Whether Reportable**

**Yes/No**  
**Yes/No**