

212

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

CRM-M-31937-2020 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 01.10.2021

Sonu

.....Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

212-A

CRM-M-2595-2020 (O&M)

Sonu

....Petitioner

vs.

State of Haryana

....Respondent

212-B

CRM-M-3163-2020

Vikash @ Vicky

...Petitioner

vs.

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present: Mr. Mayank Gupta, Advocate,
for the petitioner (in CRM-M-31937-2020).

Mr. Parveen Chauhan, Advocate, for
Mr. Rajiv Vij, Advocate,
for the petitioner (in CRM-M-2595-2020).

Mr. Sube S Kaushik, Advocate,
for the petitioner (3163 of 2020).

Mr. Munish Sharma, A.A.G., Haryana.

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J. (ORAL)

Case heard via video conferencing.

These petitions have been filed under the provisions of Section

439 of the Cr.P.C., for grant of 'regular bail' to the petitioners in case FIR No. 359, dated 04.07.2018, registered at Police Station City, District Jind, for the alleged commission of offences punishable under the provisions of Sections 302/201/34 of the IPC.

The petitioner in CRM-M-31937 of 2020 having been admitted to interim bail earlier on the ground of his long custody, thereafter, his application seeking extension of interim bail was dismissed by this court vide an order passed on 16.07.2021.

Today, a communication is seen to be on record from the learned trial court (Additional Sessions Judge, Jind), dated 20.09.2021, addressed to the Assistant Registrar of this court, stating to the effect that prosecution evidence has been closed on 20.09.2021, with the case standing adjourned to 27.09.2021 for recording the statements of the accused under the provisions of Section 313 of the Cr.P.C.

That being so, with the trial at its absolute fag end and now with only defence witnesses remaining to be examined, I would see no reason to entertain these petitions at this stage, and consequently, without making any comment on the actual merits of the case, these petitions are dismissed and all interim orders stand vacated.

However, no observation made by this court, either in this order or any previous order, would be taken into consideration to determine the actual guilt or innocence of the petitioners, all such observations having been made only in the context of petitions filed under the provisions of Section 438 of the Cr.P.C.; and naturally, their guilt/innocence would be determined on the basis of evidence led.

A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of the other connected cases.

October 01, 2021
nitin

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether Reportable	No.