

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

**CRM-M-36069-2019 (O&M)**

**Date of decision: 16.01.2020**

Sumit

.... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana

.... Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMENDRA JAIN**

Present: Mr. Anmol Rattan Sidhu, Senior Advocate  
with Mr. Pratham Sethi, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Chetan Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Ramendra Jain, J.(Oral)**

**CRM-541-2020**

The application is allowed as prayed for, subject to all just exceptions. Copy of police report dated 08.10.2019 (Annexure P-3) is taken on record.

**CRM-M-36069-2019**

Through instant second petition under Section 439 Cr.P.C. prayer has been made for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in a case arising from FIR No.144 dated 19.04.2019, registered under Sections 201, 205, 420, 464, 465, 468, 471 read with Section 34 IPC (Sections 193, 297, 120-B IPC and 7 of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 added lateron) at Police Station Civil Line, District Sonapat.

According to prosecution, a racket was being run by one Pawan Bhoriya, an advocate of Sonapat, who falsely showing the death of cancer patients into a road side accident, used to cheat different insurance companies by claiming compensation in connivance with the kith and kin of the deceased. Petitioner is one of those kith and kin of deceased Krishan, who after receiving some money lodged false and forged claim of compensation with the

insurance company, showing the death of his father Krishan as an accidental death.

Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that out of several accused, five persons namely Sarvshri Amit, Ambuj Jain, Gaurav Sharma, Dara Singh and Dharamveer Singh, doctors by profession, who used to prepare false postmortem reports showing the death of cancer patients as accidental death, besides one Ashok @ Ashok Kumar and Dhanpati, who also in conspiracy with main accused Pawan Bhoriya, Advocate, obtained compensation falsely against the death of their kith and kin in cancer by showing the same in a road side accident, have been enlarged on bail. The case of the petitioner is on the same footing. He is in custody since 23.04.2019. Conclusion of trial may take a sufficient long time. No useful purpose would be served by detaining the petitioner any more in jail.

On the other hand, learned State counsel vehemently opposed the grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

Considering overall facts and circumstances, but without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, treating the case of the petitioner on the same parity as that of his above co-accused, the petition is allowed. Consequently, petitioner Sumit is ordered to be released on bail during pendency of trial, if not required in any other case, on his furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of Trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

**16.01.2020**

mamta

Whether speaking/non-speaking?

Whether reportable?

**(RAMENDRA JAIN)**

**JUDGE**

Yes/No

Yes/No