

229

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

Date of Decision: 18.12.2020

1. CRM-M No.41792 of 2020(O&M)

Sonu

.....Petitioner

Vs

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

2. CRM-M No.41795 of 2020(O&M)

Sonu

.....Petitioner

Vs

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: *HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH*

Present:Mr. Vijay Sangwan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajat Gautam, DAG, Haryana.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J.(Oral)

The case has been taken up for hearing through video conferencing.

Vide this common order, CRM-M No.41792 of 2020 titled Sonu Vs. State of Haryana and CRM-M No.41795 of 2020 titled Sonu Vs. State of Haryana are being disposed of. Facts are being taken from CRM-M No.41792 of 2020.

In CRM-M No.41792 of 2020, petitioner seeks grant of regular bail under Section 439 Cr.P.C in case bearing FIR No.603 dated 24.11.2019 registered under Sections 148, 149, 307, 323, 376, 452, 506, 511 IPC and Sections 25, 54 of the Arms Act at Police Station City Mahendergarh, District Mahendergarh (however, challan has been presented under Sections 148, 149, 294, 307, 354-A, 452, 506 IPC and Sections 25, 54 of the Arms Act)

In CRM-M No.41795 of 2020, petitioner seeks grant of regular bail under Section 439 Cr.P.C in case bearing FIR No.602 dated 24.11.2019 registered under Sections 148, 149, 307, 323, 376, 452, 506, 511 IPC and Sections 25, 54 of the Arms Act at Police Station City Mahendergarh, District Mahendergarh (however, challan has been presented under Sections 148, 149, 294, 427, 307, 506 IPC and Sections 25, 54 of the Arms Act)

Learned counsel for the petitioner relies upon CRM-M No.25067 of 2020 and CRM-M No.25064 of 2020 to contend that co-accused Naveen @ Radhey has been granted bail in both the FIRs No.602 and 603 on even date in which composition of accused persons is the same. The aforesaid FIRs have been registered within a span of half an hour. Learned counsel further submits that for the detailed reasons

recorded in the aforesaid cases, the case of the petitioner cannot be segregated, rather the same is at par with Naveen @ Radhey.

The factual position of the case could not be disputed by learned State counsel except to say that the petitioner is having antecedent behaviour of criminal activities as he was involved in number of cases.

At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in other cases, the petitioner has been acquitted.

For the reasons recorded in CRM-M No.25067 of 2020 and CRM-M No.25064 of 2020, both these petitions are allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to his furnishing adequate bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/concerned Duty Magistrate.

Nothing expressed hereinabove would be construed to be an expression of any opinion on merits of the case.

18.12.2020
Prince

(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No