

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

220

CRM-M-7334-2021

Date of Decision: 22.02.2021

Chaman Parkash @ Chaman

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present: Mr. Rohit Mittal, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Ramesh K. Ambavta, AAG, Haryana,
assisted by SI Mehar Singh.

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has approached this Court seeking grant of regular bail in respect of a case registered against him vide FIR No.215 dated 06.10.2020 at Police Station Ateli, District Mohindergarh, under Sections 148/149/323/307 IPC and Section 25/54/59 of Arms Act.
2. The FIR in question was lodged at the instance of Sanjeev @ Sanjay, wherein it has been alleged that on 06.10.2020, he alongwith Manoj, Ghanshayam and Virender were going on car bearing registration No.HR19H-6595, which was being driven by him. It is alleged that at about 4.05 PM, when he parked the car near Kanina Chowk, Ateli Mandi, Ghanshayam alighted from the car while he was sitting on the driver seat. It is alleged that at that point of time, a Bolero camper car came from the side of Kanina

and hit against their car and resultantly their car struck with a fruit *Rehri*. Thereafter, three more vehicles came there and 20/25 persons alighted from the said vehicles and started firing at them with an intention to kill them. The said persons attacked their car with sticks, *farsi*, iron rod and sword. It is alleged that one bullet hit on the hand of the complainant. While Jitender ran away, Manoj was hit on his hip with a bullet. He also sustained injuries on his head. The complainant identified some of the accused as Deva, Rahul Lamba, Pawan Lamba, Rahu, Maandi, Devi Lal Pahari, Pardeep @ Jurat, Shiv Kumar, Rantej and Sonu Titar.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that he is nowhere named in the FIR and has been nominated as an accused on the basis of alleged disclosure statements made by some other co-accused, namely, Vikas, Anurag, Parvesh, Sahil, Ankit, Pardeep and Rantej. It has been submitted that such like disclosure statements cannot be said to be substantive evidence and as such, the petitioner deserves the concession of bail particularly when challan already stands presented.
4. Opposing the petition, learned State counsel has submitted that since large number of co-accused have consistently named the petitioner to be the accused who had fired at the complainant, no case for grant of bail is made out. Learned State counsel has, however, informed that the petitioner has been behind bars since the last about 4 ½ months and that he is not involved in any other case.
5. I have considered rival submissions addressed before this Court.

6. Having regard to the fact that the petitioner is not named in the FIR and is alleged to have been nominated on the basis of disclosure statements made by co-accused, the admissibility and veracity of which would be debatable and while noticing the fact that the petitioner has been behind bars since the last about 4 ½ months and that challan already stands presented, further detention of the petitioner will not serve any useful purpose particularly when trial is yet to commence. The petition, as such, is accepted and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned.

22.02.2021

Vimal

(GURVINDER SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

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