

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-45209-2019

Date of Decision: 06.01.2020

Parveen @ Commander

.. Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana

..Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Mr. Chanderhas Yadav, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Tanushree Gupta, DAG, Haryana.

...

Manoj Bajaj, J. (Oral)

Petitioner Parveen @ Commander has filed this petition under Section 439 Cr.P.C. for grant of regular bail in case FIR No. 52 dated 15.01.2019 under Sections 307, 323, 324, 379-B, 506 and 34 IPC, 1860 and Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959, registered at Police Station City Narnaul, District Mohindergarh at Narnaul. He is in custody since his arrest on 01.04.2019.

The FIR in the present case has been registered on the statement of complainant Sumit Kumar, wherein it was alleged that on 09.01.2019 at about 11:00 AM, he along with Namit was going to Narnaul on his two wheeler bearing No.HR-35-G-7398 and when he reached near Raghunathpura, Hanuman Temple, a Bolero vehicle hit his motorcycle from behind and both of them fell down. The Bolero was driven ahead and reversed at a high speed in order to kill them. But he and his companion saved themselves by leaving the road and ran towards the crusher.

According to the complainant, three-four young persons alighted from the

Bolero vehicle, who were armed with sword, iron rod and countrymade pistol and gave beatings to complainant and Namit. The injuries were caused by Parveen @ Commander, Manoj @ Kallu, Ankit Jangid, Jantri Yadav along with two-three boys to the complainant and Namit. Parveen @ Commander gave lathi danda blow to the complainant and Namit and thereafter, he along with Manoj @ Kallu had also snatched away ₹2200/- from the pocket of the complainant. On these broad allegations, the FIR was registered.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that main accused Manoj @ Kallu and other co-accused have already been granted the concession of regular bail. He submits that the petitioner is stated to have given lathi blow to complainant and Namit and all the injuries are simple in nature. He further states that the investigation of the case is complete and the trial is likely to consume time and further custody of the petitioner may not be required.

On the other hand, learned State counsel, who is assisted by ASI Ram Bhagat, has opposed the prayer. However, it is not disputed that case of the petitioner is at par with co-accused, who have already been granted the concession of regular bail by this Court.

Considering the custody period of the petitioner and the fact that the trial is likely to consume considerable time, this Court is of the opinion that further detention of the petitioner may not be justified. Resultantly, without meaning any expression of opinion on the merits of the case, it is ordered that the petitioner be released on regular bail subject to his furnishing requisite bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court concerned.

The petition is allowed.

06.01.2020
Jasmine Kaur

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether reportable	No