

CRM-M-1702-2021

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

CRM-M-1702-2021 (O & M)

Date of decision:27.04.2021

Sandeep @ Laddu

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Ramnish Puri, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Pardeep Prakash Chahar, DAG, Haryana.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

Case is taken up for hearing through video conferencing.

Through this petition, the petitioner seeks regular bail in case bearing FIR No.758 dated 11.10.2020, registered at Police Station City Jagadhri, District Yamuna Nagar, under Sections 285 IPC, Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act, 1959 (Sections 307 and 387 added and Section 285 IPC deleted subsequently).

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that no injury was attributed to the petitioner, who has been in custody since 16.10.2020. The recovery was effected from the petitioner and co-accused. Moreover, co-accused, namely Tejinder has been granted anticipatory bail by a Coordinate Bench, vide order dated 09.03.2021 passed in CRM-M-34816-2020. So far as other four cases registered against the petitioner, as mentioned in the custody certificate, are concerned, he stands acquitted in

CRM-M-1702-2021

one case and released on bail in the remaining three cases.

While opposing the aforesaid submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, learned State counsel submits that recovery of country-made pistols was effected from the petitioner and co-accused, Mukesh. However, he does not dispute the factum of grant of regular bail to co-accused, Rojan Jamesh, by the Court of Session and anticipatory bail to co-accused, Tejinder, by a Coordinate Bench of this Court.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

No injury has been attributed to the petitioner. He has been in custody since 16.10.2020. The trial of the case would take time to conclude. Apart from it, the belligerent re-surge of pandemic COVID-19 in the country has once again forced the government to impose various restrictions to curb the contagion, and it would further delay the conclusion of trial. Therefore, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind the bars.

In view of the above, without commenting anything on the merits, lest it should prejudice the case of either side, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

27.04.2021

parveen kumar

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No