

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

212

**CRM-M-5246-2021
Decided on : 11.02.2021**

Ajit

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

(Through Video Conferencing)

PRESENT: Mr. Kunal Dawar, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Rajiv Goel, DAG, Haryana
assisted by ASI Bhajan Lal.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (Oral)

The instant petition has been filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C. for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 303, dated 02.06.2020, under Sections 147, 149, 323, 506, 307 IPC and Sections 25/54/59 of the Arms Act, 1959 (Sections 186, 353, 325, 120-B IPC added later on), registered at Police Station Mujessar, District Faridabad, Haryana.

Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that the petitioner has been in custody since 07th July, 2020 and only challan has been presented in the case in hand. He further submits that the false implication of the petitioner is evident from the fact that even though the complainant and the petitioner were well known and well acquainted with each other, he was neither named nor assigned any role in the FIR in question, which was registered soon after the alleged occurrence. He further contends that the petitioner was nominated as an accused in the supplementary statement of the complainant made on 16th August, 2020, i.e. after two months of the alleged occurrence, wherein, it was alleged that the petitioner was driving the vehicle in which all the

accused were travelling at the time of occurrence in question.

Per contra, learned State counsel while opposing the prayer and submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner, on instructions from ASI Bhajan Lal, has not been able to controvert the factual aspect of the submissions so made by learned counsel for the petitioner. Learned State counsel has submitted that the petitioner is involved in two other criminal cases.

Heard.

In view of the submissions made by learned counsel for the parties, I deem it a fit case for grant of the concession of regular bail to the petitioner, as the trial is unlikely to conclude in the near future, more so, in the prevailing conditions due to the outbreak of COVID-19. The petition as such is allowed and the petitioner is admitted to bail to the satisfaction of trial Court/Duty Magistrate. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

February 11, 2021

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes/No*
Whether Reportable: *Yes/No*